

then released to serve the Communist propaganda purposes as has been the case of some of the civilians?

It is time for Mr. Hammarskjöld to make his report to the United Nations and to the people of America.

What is intended to be done about Communist failure to comply with the terms of the Korean armistice?

If the United Nations as an organization is paralyzed from taking action, then the Government of the United States has an obligation to men wearing the uniform of this country to take some effective steps in getting our men released.

There was a time at the turn of the century when a single American civilian held as a captive brought from President Theodore Roosevelt the effective ultimatum: "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead."

Now our associates want to reward the Communists with membership in the United Nations.

Have we forgotten the biblical injunction in Second Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?"

There are many persons at home and abroad who believe the Chinese Communists are now merely following a long-established technique to use negotiations (as at Panmunjom) for the purpose of building up their striking power.

Their minimum price will be a downpayment of the offshore island groups of Quemoy and Matsu and admission into the United Nations. Their ultimate price, which they will hope to get by negotiation or through the United Nations, or by armed conflict, will be Formosa and the Pescadores.

In the long history of the Soviet Union or the shorter history of Communist China, there is nothing to demonstrate that the Communist-pledged word is worth the paper on which it is written.

The bones of the repudiated Soviet treaties and agreements with Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Finland, and the Republic of China, together with the 1933 Litvinov compact with the United States are there for all to see.

More recently the violations of the Korean and Geneva armistice agreements by Communist China are an additional warning signal against placing either our faith or the survival of our friends and allies on the cynical smiling facade of a brutal Chou en-lai.

Just recently, I had a letter from an Air Force pilot in Formosa. In his letter to me of February 12, this pilot wrote:

"As an Air Force jet pilot assigned to this island for the next 2 years, I am sure my interest in lasting world peace is as acute as is any American's."

"The presence here of my wife and children tends to intensify my natural desire that no one toss any atom or hydrogen bombs this way."

"I am quite convinced that my best chances as well as those of my country and the entire free world rest with the firm 'stop the Communist march' movement which you so forcibly represent. I have flown 400 combat missions and would rather fly 400 more than to see my kind of a world go down the drain 1 island or 1 small country at a time."

"America must wake up to the real intentions of communism and take real and purposeful steps to frustrate those intentions."

Export of Scrap Iron and Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 13, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, whatever may be the intentions, some of our shortsighted policies are actually helping Soviet Russia. There seems to be considerable confusion between the Department of Commerce and the Department of State over the matter of the export of scrap iron from the United States. I do not think it is too much to ask that the Department of Commerce and the Department of State pass 1 or 2 resolutions, first, that they are part of the same Government; and, second, that it might be well, since they might agree that they are part of the same Government, to have a uniform policy on a matter which affects our foreign trade and foreign policy.

Our domestic steel industry is trying to compel Western Europe to buy semi-finished steel or finished steel. They are trying to prohibit export of scrap iron and seem to have the blessing of the Department of Commerce in doing so. As a result, they are unknowingly or otherwise providing Russia with a powerful lever to force Western Europe to ship copper to them, despite the free world shortage of copper and the fact that it is a strategic material badly needed in Russia.

I respectfully suggest it is time for the White House to take a look at conflicting

viewpoints between the Department of State and the Department of Commerce on this issue, and establish an American policy that takes into account what Russia is doing to take advantage of the present situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, an article from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of Wednesday, April 13, telling of a talk on this situation by Eliot Janeway, a recognized authority on economic research.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRAP EXPORT IMPASSE SEEN AIDING RUSSIA—REDS GETTING COPPER IN DEAL WITH BRITAIN, ECONOMIST REPORTS

The problem of export of scrap iron and steel to Europe is tied in with Russian procurement of copper and presents a knotty problem to the administration in Washington, in the opinion of a New York economist.

Eliot Janeway, of New York, editor of Janeway's Memos, an economic service to business, was in Pittsburgh last night to address the advance management group of the School of Industrial Administration of Carnegie Institute of Technology in Webster Hall Hotel.

DECISION UP TO WHITE HOUSE

Many of the ideas discussed with a reporter were touched upon in the economist's address.

It is his opinion that the White House will have to decide the question of whether unrestricted scrap exports to Europe shall be permitted. At present, there is a trickle of scrap exports under license.

The State Department has decided there is no scrap shortage in the United States, while the Commerce Department is in the corner of steel producers, who wish scrap exports to be prohibited. The steel industry says, in effect, that if Europe needs metals, it should buy semi-finished or finished steel.

RUSSIA SHIPPING TO ENGLAND

During the impasse, according to Janeway, Russia is shipping pig iron to England at a delivered price slightly under the delivered price of American steel scrap there. As part of the pig iron deal, there is a reciprocity arrangement, he said, whereby England supplies Russia with badly needed copper.

Janeway said that the decision on larger scrap steel exports should be made on a basis of the least cost to the American economy. In any event, he is in favor of permitting scrap exports only if the steel made from it is used by Western Europe for defense purposes.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 16, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the inspiration of all sincere and earnest prayers and their only answer, help us to believe and know that the secret of a happy and victorious life is to be found in a mind and heart inhabited and controlled by Thy Spirit.

May we begin this new week with the glad assurance that what we need more than anything else in the strain and stress of life, both for our peace and power, is Thy divine presence and guidance.

Inspire us with the certainty that there are no crises we cannot face, no temptations we cannot master, no problems we cannot solve, no wrongs we cannot set right, and no victories for righteousness and justice we cannot win when Thou art our companion and counselor.

Grant that we may never become disheartened and discouraged as we continue to set ourselves to the difficult task of building a nobler civilization and seek to help all mankind achieve the highest and happiest kind of life.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Saliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristot Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gabriella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 913. An act for the relief of Hildgard Noble;
 H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;
 H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;
 H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrali;
 H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;
 H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;
 H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Mihalka;
 H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;
 H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;
 H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Ligh;
 H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;
 H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Calado;
 H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;
 H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;
 H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;
 H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;
 H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa;
 H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;
 H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendell;
 H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;
 H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);
 H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;
 H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandez Montes Rocha;
 H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;
 H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Bulleath and Lenora Patricia Bulleath;
 H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;
 H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;
 H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;
 H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;
 H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;
 H. R. 1906. An act for the relief of Fay Jeanette Lee;
 H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;
 H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Ramlauskas;
 H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;
 H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;
 H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;
 H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Fligor (nee Sproul);
 H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;
 H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;
 H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;
 H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;
 H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;
 H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;
 H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;
 H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; and
 H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachel Luyse Kubicek.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 957. An act for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristof, his wife Jordana Diloza Cristof, and his children, George and Daphne-Kremena Cristof;
 H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of Federico Ungar Finaly;
 H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy;
 H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Mantikas, Anne Francis Mantikas, Yvonne Mantikas, Mary Mantikas, and John Mantikas; and
 H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura;
 S. 430. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller;
 S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer;
 S. 715. An act for the relief of Toy Lin Chen;
 S. 892. An act for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez;
 S. 1035. An act for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox;
 S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kavar;
 S. 1513. An act for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis;
 S. 1517. An act for the relief of Rosita A. Jocson;
 S. 1521. An act for the relief of Garabed Papazian;
 S. 1581. An act for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis;
 S. 1645. An act to provide for extension of mortgage purchase contracts of the Federal National Mortgage Association;
 S. 1654. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Boa;
 S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri;
 S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.;
 S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary; and
 S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Bernardino Canares Scalo.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. WHITTEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5239) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the investigation of the air-navigation system generally known as visual omnirange distance measuring equipment tactical air navigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DAVY CROCKETT

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, interest in the Davy Crockett story is not confined to the boys and girls of this country. Last Thursday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], speaking in the well of the House, referred to that story and drew certain lessons from the record and career of this great American when he served as a Member of the Congress more than 100 years ago. Davy Crockett is generally understood to have been a native of the State of Tennessee. A mere statement of that fact, however, does not tell the entire story. When Davy Crockett was born on August 17, 1786, the State of Tennessee was not in existence. It was then a part of the territory which comprised the State of North Carolina. So it can fairly be said, Mr. Speaker, that Davy Crockett was a Tar Heel born, although we will have to concede that he was not a Tar Heel bred, and when he died he was not a Tar Heel dead. But we take great pride in the fact that he was born a resident of our State.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate that what the gentleman has said is historically correct; but in view of the popularity of the present song, the record of history probably will show that he was born on a mountaintop in Tennessee.

Mr. JONAS. I think that is true; but we in North Carolina have a right to claim part of the credit for this great American.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATERS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 231 will make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2126, to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H. R. 2126 would amend the Saline Water Act of 1952, to provide for uninterrupted continuation of the saline water conversion research program. The act of 1952 had authorized the appropriation of \$2 million to carry on a 5-year research program in order to develop economically feasible methods of converting sea and other saline waters to fresh water of a quality suitable for agricultural, municipal, and other uses. If H. R. 2126 is passed, the period of the research program would be extended, the amount authorized to be appropriated for conducting this research would be increased, and finally the bill would permit research to be carried on within specific areas in existing Government laboratories.

The report on H. R. 2126 indicates that the extension of this legislation is necessary at this time because under the provisions of the Saline Water Act of 1952 all work must be completed prior to July 15, 1957. Thus the report goes on to state that the most active research would have to be terminated by about December 1955 in order that the work might be completed under the present contracts and that the reports might be submitted by the deadline of July 1957.

Specifically H. R. 2126 would provide for the uninterrupted continuation of the saline water research program and would permit the officials in charge of the program to have the use and the help of a certain amount of technical assistance from existing Federal scientific facilities. The bill would amend present law to permit use of the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories. The present act would be amended to raise the limit of funds authorized to be appropriated from \$2 million to \$6 million. Out of this amount, not more than \$1,500,000 could be used for the direction

of the program and for the correlation and coordination of the studies and information and not more than \$500,000 could be spent for research and development in Federal laboratories. The program itself would be extended through fiscal year 1963 and would provide for 1 additional year for correlating and coordinating the results, studies, and research undertaken under the program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Department of the Interior also favors its enactment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no one who is opposed to this rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTEND HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon unanimous consent will be asked for the consideration of a resolution to extend the Hoover Commission for 30 days until June 30. Under present law it expires this May 31. This resolution would give it 30 more days, or until June 30, to make its reports, and then 90 additional days to liquidate. It is my understanding that all reports will be filed within the 30 additional days.

This morning you as Members of the House received a document on business enterprise.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it might clarify the thinking of the Members to point out that the 30-day extension would apply to the life of the Commission itself for the purpose of making its reports. The Commission would not be in existence during the 90-day period. That would simply permit the Chairman of the Commission to return to the proper agencies of the Government and to the Treasury and moneys left over, and all this and that. It is simply to wind up the activities of the Commission. The Commission itself would come to an end on June 30.

Mr. PATMAN. That means that all reports will have been made, of all types and characters?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. All reports, yes. One of the purposes of the resolution is to give time to get these reports printed.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this time was given to me in order that I may speak on this matter now and not get the time by re-

serving the right to object to the consideration of the resolution when it comes up. I have no objection to the resolution to extend the Commission 30 days, although I am not in favor of the Hoover Commission, but I would certainly be against the creation of another Hoover Commission. I feel that this is the last commission of that type we will have in the Congress. I hope so, because I think we made a serious mistake in starting out on this approach.

In the 80th Congress, when the question was first submitted to us, of having a bipartisan commission composed of a former President of the United States, who certainly knew something about the executive branch, to head the Commission as chairman, and an outstanding Democrat to be vice chairman, and the Commission to be composed of 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats in order to make a study and an investigation to prevent duplication of effort in the Government, and to prevent waste and extravagance, it certainly did appeal to all Members of the House. I know it appealed to me. It passed unanimously. It was a fine approach. It was looked upon favorably. And it was all right—they did some fine work. But then in the 83d Congress, which was 2 years ago, a resolution was passed to provide for another Hoover Commission. We naturally looked upon it as a continuation of the first Commission. But it is not a continuation of the first one. Instead of just investigating waste and extravagance, it is also going into the policymaking business as the Commission feels it has the authority to go into policymaking.

A PART OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH?

The other day I was attending a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives and I heard a chairman, Mr. J. P. Binns, of one of the Hoover Commission task forces make the statement for the record in writing that the Attorney General of the United States has ruled that the Hoover Commission is part of the legislative branch of the Government. Let me repeat that—that the Attorney General of the United States has ruled that the Hoover Commission is a part of the legislative branch of the Government. That was disturbing to me and it should be disturbing to every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You know that he cannot do any such thing as that. He cannot create a Commission. What are you talking about?

Mr. PATMAN. He has a ruling that it is part of the legislative body. Now that means that we have delegated a lot of power to an outside group. That means that we have farmed out to an outside group a lot of power that we should exercise as the legislative Representatives of the people. Under the Constitution we have the three separate branches of government. All legislative powers, of course, are vested in the House of Representatives and the Senate. There is no question about it. It is our duty. We

are elected by the people here in the House of Representatives. Every person here is elected. Not one has ever been appointed and under our present system, no one will ever be appointed to the House of Representatives. In the other body, of course, under certain conditions, a Member can be appointed by the governor of a State until the next election, but they are generally selected and elected by the people. So in these two bodies, the legislative power is in the House and Senate, the Members of which are elected by the people, and we are charged with the duty of doing all the legislative work that is to be done under our form of government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why you know and every schoolboy knows that the legislative power—the first 15 words of the Constitution state that the legislative power is vested in the Congress. So what are you talking about? What is the idea?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I thought the gentleman would be disturbed when he found out that he actually, he and I, delegated some of that power we did not know we delegated to this Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, we cannot do that.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we have anyway according to the report of the ruling of the Attorney General of the United States. We have anyway.

Mr. Speaker, whenever there is a suggestion of a change in our Government coming from anyone, and I do not care where such a suggestion may originate, that suggestion and idea should be given consideration. Whether such a suggestion comes from the Hoover Commission or from any member of a task force or anyone else, it should be given consideration.

But who should consider it? Should some outside agency consider it? No. A committee of the Congress should consider it. A congressional committee should have before it any person it wants to hear. Mr. Hoover? Certainly, he should be heard, but he should be heard before a congressional committee. Certainly members of the task forces, who have unusual knowledge and information about subjects which they are on the task force to represent, should be heard, not by an outside agency or an outside commission, but should be heard by a recognized committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate. In other words, when you delegate to a group to assemble facts for you, as the Hoover Commission has been doing, whenever you delegate to a group to present to you conclusions on which to act and pass legislation, we are going beyond what was intended in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If what you say is true, that the Congress delegated legislative power to the Hoover Commission, how come it does not legislate? What are we doing here?

Mr. PATMAN. They do not legislate, but they have a lot to do with legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, you say we delegated legislative power to the Hoover Commission.

Mr. PATMAN. I will explain to you what I mean.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very well. I am listening.

Mr. PATMAN. We have delegated or farmed out important functions of the legislative branch; that is, to let a private agency—and some of them have conflicting interests—get up the facts for the Congress and present to us conclusions for us based on their assembled facts to act on. We do not have any of the detailed information. They have that in their own files, but they get up the facts as they want them assembled for presentation. They arrive at their conclusions and present them to us, and then they try to force those conclusions through in the form of a law. Therefore, they have an important legislative function to perform, and they are performing it. They have an important agency. Of course, it is unofficial, but they have an important agency to help them. It is the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

Before you received this booklet on Business Enterprises that came in this morning, the most recent report of the Hoover Commission, you received on Saturday or Sunday, or 1 or 2 days before, this report from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, telling you about this Business Enterprises report. In other words, this lobbying organization gets the information first from the Hoover Commission and the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; this lobbying organization gives you a clarification, evaluation, and appraisal of what the Hoover Commission has done through it, the lobbying group; that is, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Of whom are they composed? Some of the finest and best people in the country but most of them have their own axes to grind. They solicit contributions from the biggest corporations in the country to carry on this pressure group. They get contributions from corporations, individuals, and everybody. They are a lobbying organization, but yet they have not registered. I do not know why they have not. They should. They are violating the law. There are 33 smaller, little Hoover organizations in the States. They have not registered either. They are raising money. They are trying to pressure Congress into passing laws. They are violating the Lobbying Act. They have not registered either. Yet we get this information through this lobbying organization, this unregistered lobbying organization.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just who is violating the law? What law are they violating?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, we have the Lobby Registration Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know about that, but who is violating it?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going into the details, but the Lobbying Act pro-

vides that people who are raising money to pressure Congress are supposed to register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives. They have not done it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without getting into the friendly colloquy between the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Michigan in talking about violations, something may not be legalistically a violation, but the spirit of the law could be violated.

Mr. PATMAN. This is both, in the spirit and the plain letter of the law. There is no question on earth about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not quite understand the gentleman's argument. It seems to me, from my viewpoint, that what the Hoover Committee does is to gather facts and then make certain deductions. When we pass on one of their proposals, if we are interested, and I have been interested in some, and need a factual statement on which they support their conclusions, it is submitted. If we do not like their proposal we turn it down. How in the world does that infringe on the powers of Congress? I really cannot understand the gentleman, and he is one of the most intelligent men in Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for the compliment, and I will state that I know the gentleman from California is a very sincere and able Member of this House. He asked a question expecting a sincere answer; he sincerely asked it and I will try my best to answer it.

The truth is that this power delegated to the Hoover Commission has been farmed out and delegated—this power from the Congress. It was in the 80th Congress to investigate waste and extravagance, but since the last Hoover Commission was organized they have gone out into policymaking. So there is where they overreach into the legislative.

If all the committees would do as the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] suggests that his committee would be expected to do, it would be all right; but they have not been doing that, and they are not going to do it. What they should do, just like the gentleman from California said his committee would do, is to call Mr. Hoover up before the committee and say: "Mr. Hoover, you have made certain recommendations here; upon what do you base them?"

Then he would turn to one of his task forces for assistance. He has a task force of 15 to 25 men on every subject. He would ask the chairman of the task force to come around and explain it to the members. He has volumes of information and testimony, files filled with all kinds of documentary evidence, which, of course, the gentleman is not going into. From that information, from these facts he has gotten up certain conclusions which he is giving to you, and this Hoover Commission back in the gentleman's home State is wiring him every day and every night, and writing him letters and putting on a propaganda campaign: "Be sure and pass Hoover recommendation No. 4. Pass Hoover recommendation No. 4; we want it done."

There is where the pressure comes in and whether you are a Member of Congress or not, you will forget the facts and the conclusions they arrived at and begin to think about Hoover recommendation No. 4, or whatever the number is.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Many people get letters from a great many groups in the country, but we do not always give in to the so-called pressure. Most of the men I know in Congress abhor pressure, and I really cannot see why the committee that has to do with this subject cannot call Mr. Hoover, if it wishes his conclusions fortified by evidence taken by the Commission or one of the task forces. It could subpoena him and question him concerning his conclusions. Customarily a recommendation by the Hoover Commission is accompanied by a full explanation in writing to support its conclusions. The congressional committee would not have to accept the recommendation and, of course, neither of the branches of the Congress would have to accept it. But just the mere fact that Mr. Hoover does not always appear as a witness should not condemn what he has asked the Congress to do, which I think is usually very constructive.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman believes, then, that they should call Mr. Hoover and the members of the task force that made the recommendations.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I said they could do it if they wished to.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman think they should?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not want to tell congressional committees what they should do, but we have had Mr. Hoover before the Armed Services Committee of the House on several occasions to explain various matters to us.

Mr. PATMAN. For the gentleman's information, every time the members of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report sends out something to their Members that needs legislation to carry out the Hoover recommendation it gives them the names of the members of the Senate committee that will handle it, the States that the members are from, and also gives you the names of the House committee and the States that they are from, so that the people can immediately commence pressuring these members to get a bill out of committee. That is bypassing Congress to that extent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman is sincere in everything he said, but I believe he should differentiate in his own mind and we should differentiate in our minds, individually and

collectively, between the so-called Hoover Commission and the voluntary National Committee for the Hoover Report, which is an entirely separate organization and over which the Hoover Commission has no control.

Mr. PATMAN. May I interrupt to say that Mr. Hoover is the president of that organization. He is the honorary president of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. He certainly is not the honorary president of that organization.

Mr. PATMAN. But he is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. He has been given certain recognition through it, but he does not control or run it and the Commission certainly does not. I as one member of the Commission want to say that I had nothing to do with the selection or organization of any committee in support of or in opposition to any of the Hoover reports. If Mr. Hoover has had any connection with that organization it is purely a personal matter and one that has not been done by the committee, which is an arm of the Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Some of your task force members are directors of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I appreciate the fact that perhaps the gentleman as a Member of Congress may also be interested in some outside activities.

Mr. PATMAN. Not like this and no other Members either.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is an author in his spare time and he has done a very good job. Let us try to differentiate and not try to tie the two together. I would like to point out one other thing if I may. That is that any suggestion or recommendation or finding of the Hoover Commission comes to the Congress and it is entirely up to the Congress as to what may or may not be done with it. The Commission itself does not legislate.

Mr. PATMAN. I am going to conclude with the expression of the hope that every committee that has anything to do with these reports will call not only Mr. Hoover but members of the Commission who know anything about the reports and also the task forces. Remember, these task forces are the only ones that did the work and they are exempt from the conflict in interest statute. A lot of them are interested adversely to the Government on these reports. They admit that and they know it. They are serving without compensation from the Government, but are paid by their private employers, there is no question about that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, of course, well knows that the various committees of the Congress do call members of these task forces before them. For instance, last week where there was a question or a dispute that arose between some of the military departments and some of the members of the task force in their report, a committee of the House, the Committee on Government Operations, did hold a hearing

and heard witnesses from both the task force and from the military department involved. I believe also that the gentleman from Texas appeared before that committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

AN EXACT COPY OF ACT CREATING HOOVER COMMISSION

I am inserting a copy of Public Law 108, 83d Congress, which created the Hoover Commission during the 1st session of Congress of President Eisenhower's administration. It is as follows:

[Public Law 108, 83d Cong., ch. 184, 1st sess.]

S. 106

An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

- (1) recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;
- (2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;
- (3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;
- (4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government;
- (5) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise;
- (6) defining responsibilities of officials; and
- (7) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

- (1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;
 - (2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and
 - (3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.
- (b) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the Government except the Judiciary and the Congress of the United States to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time, or times, as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, and shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1955, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by sub-

pena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Approved July 10, 1953.

I desire to particularly call your attention to the following facts:

First. That a Commission of 12 members is established to carry out the declared policy.

Second. That a member of the Commission, or any individual employed by the Commission, shall be exempt from the laws prohibiting such a person from serving who has an interest in conflict with the United States Government.

Third. The 12 members are appointed; 4 by the President, 4 by the President of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Fourth. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, section 4.

Fifth. The appointments made by the Commission are exempt from the provisions of civil-service laws and the classification acts.

Sixth. An appropriation is authorized, which up to date has been about \$2,585,059 for less than 2 years' work, and the Commission is asking for about \$350,000 more, which will make over \$3 million in all.

Seventh. The Commission is authorized to make a study of all agencies of the Government except the Judiciary and the Congress.

Eighth. A comprehensive report of its activities was required to be made to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, with a final report not later than May 31, 1955.

Ninth. The Commission is authorized to have hearings and to sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such documents as the Commission or the subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

SPECIFIC CRITICISMS OF THE COMMISSION ASSUMING POLICYMAKING POWER IT DOES NOT HAVE

I desire to invite the attention of the Members to certain criticisms of the

present Commission that I believe are justified, as follows:

First. It is not a bipartisan commission as advertised by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and by the Hoover Commission itself. It is composed of 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats. The people are led to believe by the statements issued by Mr. Hoover and others that it is a bipartisan commission like the first Hoover Commission, under President Truman, set up in 1949. The first Commission was bipartisan, composed of 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats, with Mr. Hoover, a Republican, as chairman, and Mr. Dean Acheson, a Democrat, as vice chairman.

Second. Mr. Hoover has refused to put the question to the Commission of the selection of a vice chairman, and this new Commission has never had a vice chairman, which is contrary to the plain language of the law. This gives the chairman full authority. It creates a doubt as to the legality of the whole Commission as it is not organized in accordance with the plain language of the law under section 4 of the act creating the Commission. Section 10 of the act gives the vice chairman specific responsibility.

Third. A Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report is set up with Mr. Hoover, chairman of the Commission, as honorary chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Many individuals connected with the Hoover Commission are members of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and some are directors. This committee receives advance copies of all reports of the Hoover Commission and takes care of the public relations and releases publicity favorable to the Hoover Commission when the reports are released. In fact, a Member of Congress almost invariably receives a report from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report in the same mail with the report the Commission itself is making on the subject or ahead of it.

Fourth. The law setting up the Hoover Commission does not permit the establishment of a subcommittee, or a task force, to do the work of the Commission. The work must be directed, including all hearings, by the Commission itself, or by a subcommittee of the Commission, or a member of the Commission. Instead, Chairman Hoover has organized what is called task forces that have conducted the hearings without the presence of a member of the Commission.

Fifth. The Attorney General of the United States has ruled that the Hoover Commission is a part of the legislative branch of the Government, according to the testimony of J. P. Binn, chairman of a task force before the Committee on Government Operations of the House last week. This means that Congress has farmed out part of its legislative duties, and, further, members and employees of the Commission should take the oath of office as other public officials are required to take.

Sixth. Under the first Hoover Commission in 1949, task force members were selected, subject to the approval of the whole Commission. Under this new setup, or present Hoover Commission, the

Chairman received authority from a majority of the other members of the Commission to make all the appointments himself without referring them to the Commission for approval, and having no Vice Chairman, Mr. Hoover did all the appointing and confirming himself.

Seventh. This Commission has encouraged a lobbying organization, a Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, that is acting contrary to the law requiring the registration of lobbyists. The national organization is not registered; neither is any State organization of this group registered. This is in plain violation of the law.

Eighth. A careful reading of the act creating the present Hoover Commission will disclose that it does not give the Commission policymaking powers as assumed by the Commission.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS OF THE FIRST HOOVER COMMISSION

In the publication by a citizen's committee for the Hoover Report published in the latter part of 1953, it was stated:

Groups of distinguished citizens who are familiar with a specific field to be reviewed and unbiased in their approach to the problem make a study of broad fields of Government activity and administration. Subsequently the task forces formulate their conclusions and make recommendations to the Commission.

Up to this time the Commission has set up about 12 task forces bearing from 8 to 26 members each. There are now 140 members on its staff. In an address that Mr. Hoover delivered at the National Press Club March 10, 1954, he stated:

Last time we had a limited authority. It did not cover policy questions. This time our authority to inquire and to recommend is almost unlimited. The law provides, however, that we leave the Congress alone. This time we are required to present the actual legislation which will express our recommendations in legal terms. This time we have some teeth. We can subpoena documents and persons.

No one would minimize the immense importance of inquiries by congressional committees. The difference is that they are seldom specialists in these matters. And among their multitude of responsibilities they have little time or staff for such highly technical inquiries. Moreover, few Members of the Congress have served in the executive branch of the Government.

Up to date we have set up 10 task forces, varying from 8 to 26 members on each. The 140 members of our staff, so far chosen, are solely from among professional men, business executives, or former Government employees. They are all men in responsible positions outside the Government. Government spending and taxes are no academic abstraction to them. They cause them acute grief.

CONGRESS FARMING ITS WORK OUT?

These task forces are being called upon to perform duties that Members of Congress are charged with performing. Members of Congress are elected by the people for that purpose. There is no reason why Congressmen should farm this work out to private groups. If Members were given the same help that experts, economists, and technical advisers can give and has provided to these task forces, the Congressmen could perform these duties much better and more

satisfactorily. Mr. Hoover says that the Congressmen have little time or staff for such highly technical inquiries. This can be overcome. Congressmen on committees occupy a position similar to a judge or a jury in a trial of a case in the courthouse. They listen to all the testimony and then make up their minds. That is much better from the standpoint of the people than having people who are biased or prejudiced serving on these task forces and who are not charged with the responsibility of protecting the people's interest. Furthermore if Congressmen are conducting the hearing, they will make up their minds how to vote on a proposal. A task force member can only help prepare a record for the information of Congress. If task force members should desire, they could very easily prepare a record that would support their personal views.

Mr. Hoover in a letter to the press January 13, 1954, stated:

For the purpose of amassing the facts each task force has been given adequate research staff.

Considering the fact that a member of the task force is paid \$50 a day and expenses for the time that he serves and considering the cost to the Government for other purposes including experts, economists, and other help, it would probably be less expensive to the Government to furnish each Member of Congress an administrative assistant which would put the Members in a position to do the work and do it in a more satisfactory way than the Hoover Commission.

It will take a lot of congressional committees to spend as much as this second Hoover Commission is spending.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR HOOVER REPORT WRITES SPEECHES FOR CANDIDATES IN 1954 CAMPAIGN

In 1954, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report prepared and sent out to congressional candidates what was called Congressional Candidate's Packet on Better Government.

It was an elaborately prepared brochure setting forth what was considered great accomplishments of the first Hoover Commission and the great accomplishments expected and aims of the new Hoover Commission.

It stated:

This kit has been prepared by the bipartisan Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. * * * It is being sent simultaneously to all candidates of both parties.

It further stated:

The Citizens Committee believes that this is a splendid opportunity for candidates of both parties * * * to encourage the new Commission in its endeavors.

After the first page, there is a suggested plank for a congressional platform, pledging support of all Hoover Commission recommendations which further the objective of better government. Also attached is a self-addressed, stamped postal card to be returned by the candidate to let the Citizens Committee know that the packet has been received and he will make active use of it and that "I subscribe to its objective of a more economical and efficient Federal Government." Also enclosed is a

suggested speech for use by congressional candidates, starting off:

It is a great pleasure to be with you today and to talk briefly—yet earnestly and with all the strength at my command—of the vital need in this country for better, more efficient, and less expensive government. More than that, I want to go on record at this time in pledging my full support to these principles. You may be assured that, if I am elected by the people of this district on November 2, I will do everything in my power to insure that American taxpayers get a genuine dollar's worth of service for every dollar they pay in taxes.

I am in strong accord, as I believe you are, with the action taken by the Congress last year when it unanimously established another bipartisan Hoover Commission. * * * Last year a new Hoover Commission was created—again bipartisan in its membership and again searching for new ways and means of saving money for the taxpayers. * * *

In conclusion, I would be remiss if I were not to express my thanks to each of you for the interest you have shown in my candidacy. Your support is something I cherish today and shall cherish always.

One final word—I want to restate my pledge to do everything in my power to insure that the American taxpayers get a genuine dollar's worth of services for every dollar they pay in taxes. I promise you I shall never give up in my fight for better government.

PRESS RELEASE ALSO PREPARED

After the suggested speech, there is a press release on the speech by a congressional candidate, which is already prepared with nothing remaining to be done except the insertion of the candidate's name and the district and State that he is from. The release also contained the following statement, which was in the prepared speech:

I am in strong accord, as I believe you are, with the action taken by the Congress last year when it unanimously established another bipartisan Hoover Commission. * * * I support the objectives of the Commission and intend to carefully review its forthcoming recommendations and give my utmost backing to those which carry clear promise of Federal economy and efficiency.

In outlining his stand on the need for continued vigilance and active interest in the operations of the Federal Government referred to five specific

(Name of candidate)
instances of waste uncovered in congressional findings and through researches of the original Hoover Commission:

1. A congressional committee found that the Federal Government was supplying certain American employees in Germany with 12 water glasses—and a total of 84 liquor, beer, and wine glasses—all at the taxpayers' expense.

2. The Post Office Department was spending over twice as much money in shipping concrete mailbox posts to the west coast as the posts themselves cost in the first place.

3. In the Panama Canal Zone the Federal Government has 5 bakeries. One of these alone can produce enough bread to fill the need.

4. The Federal Government has accumulated enough records to fill eight Pentagons.

5. The Federal Government has made loans to such enterprises as: (a) A pet hospital, (b) a jukebox operator, (c) a beauty parlor, (d) an interior decorator, and (e) a snake farm.

Candidate _____ told his audience that "The people of this district can rest assured that, if elected to office, I will lend my best efforts to prevent and stop any

such examples of waste and inefficiency in the Government's administration and operations." Mr. _____ concluded by (Name of candidate) promising that he would never give up in his fight for better government.

In order, doubtless, to properly inflame the minds of the candidates and to enable the candidates to inflame the minds of the voters, a statement was inserted in the packet on conspicuously colored paper, as follows:

WASTE OF THE TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS

Set forth below are 10 examples of governmental waste: Only continuous vigilance by the Executive, the Congress, and the public will prevent such instances from occurring in the future.

1. Overseas activities: A congressional committee found that the Federal Government was supplying certain American employees in Germany with 12 water glasses—and a total of 84 liquor, beer, and wine glasses—all at the taxpayers' expense.

2. Public lands: One vast stretch of public land in Oregon is owned by the Federal Government. Divided into squares, 1 mile by 1 mile, 1 Federal Department administers the odd-numbered squares and another Department administers the even-numbered squares.

3. * * *

4. Competition with private business: The Government runs hotels, tugboats, and banks. It manufactures paper, rope, rum, clothing, spectacles, and false teeth.

5. Red tape: Each year the Federal Government writes and produces approximately 9,800,000,000 pieces of paper, or 196 pieces of paper for each family in the United States.

6. Personnel: The Federal Government not long ago spent \$500,000 in an unsuccessful endeavor to remove one employee.

7. * * *

8. Surplus files: The Federal Government has accumulated enough records to fill eight Pentagons.

9. Money for nothing: Some Federal business enterprises are permitted to buy Government bonds with interest-free money that the Government loaned them in the first place.

10. The President: Sixty-five agencies report directly to the President. If he were to spend even 1 hour a week supervising each, how could he possibly have time for his other important official duties?

Such charges are a reflection on the agencies involved and are not complimentary to Congress or congressional committees.

HORRID EXAMPLES AND APPEALS TO PREJUDICE

Excerpt from February 25, 1955, issue of Washington Report, published by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., editorial entitled "Two Hundred and Fifty Million Dollars Savings—Hoover Commission Offers Way To Cut Government Red Tape":

Here is a selection of these facts which you may find worth passing on to your friends, employees, and community leaders:

Paperwork in the Federal Government costs taxpayers \$4 billion annually.

The average family pays Uncle Sam \$100 a year as its share of the paperwork burden.

The \$4 billion annual paperwork cost is 12 times the total national budget in 1912.

The Federal Government produces 25 billion pieces of paper annually.

End to end, these pieces of paper would reach to the moon 13 times.

About 750,000 Federal employees are required to handle the paperwork.

In 40 years the volume of Government letters has increased 60 times.

Letterwriting has outpaced the growth of Government personnel 10 times.

Government records would fill a file drawer reaching from the Pentagon to the Kremlin.

The quarter of a billion dollars which would be saved annually through the Commission's program could supply 250,000 families with a \$1,000 downpayment on new homes.

ADMITS PRESSURE GROUPS

Excerpt from a reprint of a portion of Newsweek, October 18, 1954, issue, under heading "Big Government: The Hoover Team's Attack":

But the Commission's work will only be a starter in the tremendous task of setting the Federal Bureaucracy in order. Inertia and special interest will be stumbling blocks. But a counterpressure will work for enactment of the commission's recommendations—the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. This pressure group to end pressure groups has been systematically mobilizing public opinion. And it will fight tenaciously for the kind of good government which it believes "big government" precludes.

This reprint was sent out by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report just before the general election November 2, 1954.

SECRETARY WILSON WARNS SERVICEMEN TO BEWARE OF SUCH UNAMERICAN METHODS

Excerpt from publication, You and Your USA, April 14, 1954, issue, published by the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C., Hon. C. E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense:

Most pressure groups are watching out for the interests of some group of people. However, there are two dangers we should know about. First, we should not permit a pressure group to force through a proposal which will benefit one group at the expense of all the rest of us. Second, pressure groups sometimes use unethical means to achieve their objectives. In trying to win public support, they often arouse emotions and avoid the appeal to good judgment. Any organization which attempts to influence people by taking advantage of their prejudices is employing un-American methods of persuasion. The American way is through an appeal to the intelligence.

Notice what Secretary Wilson says about appeals to prejudice. Is that what the Hoover Commission is doing?

NOT INTENDED TO BE BIPARTISAN

In the packet also was a statement about the accomplishments of the Hoover Commission, which was referred to as a bipartisan commission. This reference to a bipartisan commission as the first Commission was bipartisan, but when the resolution passed in the 83d Congress to establish the second Hoover Commission, the word bipartisan was deliberately stricken out so that the authors evidently did not intend it to be a bipartisan commission.

In the packet also was a three-page statement about the facts regarding the new Hoover Commission, which contains the following paragraph:

THE COMMISSION'S METHOD OF ORGANIZATION

The Commission has utilized the task force approach to meet its problems. For each area to be examined a group of eminent citizens who have a proven competence in the

field have been appointed. These task forces vary from 5 to 26 members, the total, including consultants, being over 200. Many of them serve without compensation. The task forces, with the assistance of research staffs, investigate the important aspects of their subjects, present the facts, and make recommendations to the full Commission. The Commission has the final responsibility of making recommendations to the Congress.

Many of these task forces are divided into subcommittees of which there are a total of over 30. Where necessary the coordination of the Commission's work is accomplished by interlocking membership on the task forces or joint subcommittees.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

In the packet also was a 16-page statement of the status of the Hoover report, 1949-54.

The Hoover Commission, in February 1954, issued a release including the names of the task forces and the members thereof, as follows:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Budget and accounting: Stewart, J. Harold, chairman; Browne, Dudley E.; Humphreys, Jr., H. E.; Jarchow, Christian; Price, Gwilym Alexander; Tiffany, Kenneth C.; Wright, J. David.

Business organization of the Department of Defense: Hook, Charles R., chairman; Binns, Joseph P.; Brainard, George C.; Bruce, Howard; DeBaake, Michael; Folsom, Frank; Hall, Joseph B.; Kelly, Mervin J.; King, Arthur Franklin; Mead, George Houk; Neely, Frank H.; Robertson, Jr., Reuben B.; Schneider, Franz; Wolcott, Robert Wilson; Wood, Robert E.

Legal services and procedure: Douglas, James Marsh, chairman; Clark, Herbert Watson; Fowler, Cody; Harno, Albert J.; Landis, James McCauley; McFarland, Carl; Malone, Jr., Ross L.; Maxwell, David F.; Medina, Harold R.; Peck, David W.; Smith, Reginald Heber; Stason, E. Blythe; Tuttle, Elbert Parr; Wright, Edward Ledwidge. Consultants: Jackson, Robert H.; Roberts, George; Vanderbilt, Arthur T.

Lending agencies: Grady, Paul, chairman; Bestor, Paul; Bliss, George L.; Bodman, Henry T.; Campbell, William W.; Cole, Albert Leslie; Cooper, Clifford D.; Cowles, Gardner; Hotchkis, Preston; Keller, Arnold B.; Sproul, Allan.

Medical services: McCormick, Chauncey, chairman; Braceland, Francis J.; Brandhorst, Otto W.; Churchill, Edward D.; Crosby, Edwin L.; DeBaake, Michael; Graham, Everts A.; Gregg, Alan; Hawley, Paul R.; Klumpp, Theodore George; Leavell, Hugh Rodman; MacLean, Basil C.; Martin, Walter B.; Miller, James Roscoe; Wilbur, Dwight L.; Winternitz, Milton C.

Personnel: Dodds, Harold W., chairman; Abrams, Frank W.; Barnard, Chester I.; Cuyler, Lewis B.; Josephs, Devereux C.; Mitchell, Don G.; Paul, Willard S.; Ramspeck, Robert; Tuck, William Hallam; White, Leonard D.

Procurement: Wolcott, Robert Wilson, chairman; Folsom, Frank M.; Kelly, Mervin J.; Mead, George Houk; Mosher, Ira; Neely, Frank H.; Peale, Mundy I.; Proctor, Robert; Schneider, Franz; Stilwell, Charles J.

Subsistence services: Binns, Joseph P., chairman; Appel, Vallee O.; Coppers, George H.; Crotty, Andrew J.; Drake, Albert B.; Garvey, James McB.; Hennessy, John L.; Jones, Ollie E.; Kraft, John H.; Krimendahl, Herbert F.; Lee, Joseph A.; Mardikan, George M.; Shoemaker, Perry M.; Stouffer, Gordon A.

Surplus property: Wood, Robert E., chairman; Erlicher, Harry; Greene, Leroy D.; Igenfritz, Carl A.; Jolly, Thomas D.; Kresl, Carl; Mooney, James D.; Renard, George A.; Starr, Jr., Edward; Tangeman, Walter W. Consultant: Forbes, Russell.

Water resources and power: Moreell, Ben, chairman; Andrews, Charles L.; Bates, William B.; Brock, Pope F.; Brown, Carey H.; Edison, Charles; Growdon, James P.; Hinds, Julian; Horner, Wesley Winans; Jirgal, John; Kracke, Edward A.; Lee, J. Bracken; Mattel, Albert Chester; Miller, Leslie A.; Morrison, Harry Winford; Murrow, Lavey V.; Newman, Jr., Frank H.; Pirnie, Malcolm; Polk, Harry E.; Pound, Roscoe; Reavis, John Wallace; Richberg, Donald Randall; Roberts, Arthur B.; Sawyer, Robert William; Shannon, William D.; Tipton, Royce J.

Commission staff members: Bragg, K. B.; Brassor, Francis P.; Heddleston, Russell A.; Hollister, John B.; Kennedy, Robert A.; Kieffer, Jarold A.; Lindemer, Lawrence Boyd; McClelland, George K.; Merriam, Malcolm M.; Metz, Harold W.; Monat, Anna H.; Roback, Herbert; Scull, Jr., Miles; Shine, Jr., Henry M. Consultants: Coates, Charles B.; Klein, Julius; McCormick, Robert L. L.; Underhill, John; Westcott, Jay B.

SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION NOT LIKE FIRST

In January 1954 the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report reported to the President "for the purpose of amassing the facts, each task force has been given adequate research staff. The recommendations of the task force and their staff will be reviewed by the Commission." This discloses that the task force, contrary to law, will conduct the hearings and make the recommendation to the Commission without any member of the Commission being on the task force.

In May 1954 the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Commission issued a document, which contained the following language, "The second Hoover Commission—almost like the first—officially known like its predecessor as a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, was unanimously created by Congress on a bipartisan basis under the Brown-Ferguson Act, signed by President Eisenhower on July 10, 1953." In referring to the Commission as a bipartisan Commission, the statement leaves the distinct impression that it is bipartisan like the first Commission, which included six Democrats and six Republicans. This is not true. The word bipartisan was stricken out of the resolution creating the second Hoover Commission and the members include seven Republicans and five Democrats.

VETERANS BELITTLED

In a legislative report gotten out by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, volume 8, No. 10, it was stated:

Hoover Commission Veterans of Foreign Wars legislative service on June 3, appeared before the Hoover Commission Task Force making a study of the requirements for admission to practice before Federal boards and commissions—

And so forth. Other national veterans organizations made similar reports. Doubtless, it is crushing and belittling to a veteran of a war—many of them outstanding heroes of a war—to be required to go through a group of special-interest representatives in order to get his views presented to a Congress elected by the people. Why should any veteran, or any other citizen, be required to have his views screened through a Hoover Commission, or any other commission, in order to get them presented to elected representatives of the people?

Concerning the task forces, all members of the task forces are selected by the Chairman, Mr. Hoover. In the first Hoover Commission, all selections were approved by the entire Commission, not just by Mr. Hoover. The members appointed represent his personal choice and very likely his philosophic views. Many of the members have interest in conflict with their duties. The task force selected to consider a major political and economic question is not balanced with an equal number of those who oppose the proposal. In other words, if it is a question in which liberals and conservatives are known to oppose each other, the task force does not include as many liberals as conservatives.

AMERICAN LEGION DISAPPOINTED

The National Legislative Bulletin of the American Legion, issued March 11, 1955, contains the following statement:

"If at first you don't succeed, then try, try again!" must surely be the motto of the Hoover Commission when it goes into its studies and recommendations on reorganizing veterans' benefits and programs.

Five years ago the first Hoover Commission recommended dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration, the merging of VA hospitals into a gigantic Federal medical system, and the subjugation of veterans' preference in Federal employment. Those bitter pills were camouflaged with a coating of honeyed words that went something like this: The program for veterans will thus become more efficient; nothing will be taken away from them; they will get better service at less cost; and so on, and on. The American Legion and many Members of Congress quickly saw through this camouflage. There were but few who swallowed the pills because most everyone knew that the less-cost factor would ultimately mean less benefits and less service for the veterans.

The second Hoover Commission has changed its tactics. It comes right out and says what it wants the executive branch and the Congress to do. There is no attempt to disguise the plan.

Let's take a look at some of the recommendations.

They would set up a Federal Advisory Council on Health which would impose authority over and inhibit the administration of the VA medical and hospital system.

To save money they would close down 20 VA hospitals. This at a time when there are some 20,000 eligibles waiting for hospital treatment.

Attacking non-service-connected hospitalization now available to veterans who cannot afford to pay for hospitalization, and then only if a VA bed is available. Closing down 20 hospitals will make less beds available for this purpose. They would curtail non-service-connected hospitalization by thoroughly checking whether or not the veteran lied when he made his statement to the VA that he could not pay. Perhaps the veteran would have to wait several weeks before being admitted, while the check was being made. Further, they recommend that if the "broke" veteran ever gets on his feet and has some money, he should pay what he owes the Government for hospital treatment. Of course, this would mean that the strictly indigent veteran would be getting no veterans' preference—he would simply get an extension of credit. One can, without too much imagination, foresee the time when further recommendations are made to force the veteran to repay out of monthly compensation or pension checks, should he be fortunate enough to receive them. Underlying all this is the main effort designed to eliminate non-service-connected hospitalization entirely.

The Commission also recommends a complete reevaluation of service-connected dis-

abilities rated at 30 percent or less. Seems they think these veterans are getting too much gravy because they are working at decent salaries. The top compensation for this group is \$50 per month. It is likely that the beneficiary does have to supplement the compensation in order to get along, at least to get along very well.

To further confuse the issue, the Commission feels that the term "compensation" for war-service wounds, injury, or disease is too significant; that it should be reduced to something less understandable such as disability allowance. That goes hand in hand with still another recommendation that disabilities be geared to what a veteran is able to earn, regardless of the degree of disability. For example, if he lost an arm in the service and is now rehabilitated to make a decent living with the other arm, then his compensation consideration should be less. The American Legion has always believed that the war wounds should be compensated alike, regardless of ability to earn.

HOOVER COMMISSION PLAN TESTED

The first Hoover Commission recommended that each agency of the Government reimburse the Post Office Department for the use of the mailing privileges used by such agencies. This recommendation was carried into effect by the passage of Public Law 286, which was signed August 15, 1953. The committee report stated:

The objective of this legislation is in accordance with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

The Hoover Commission in January 1955 reported as follows:

A little over a year ago the Post Office Department was freed of bearing the entire cost of Government mail and the unrealistic deficit this had caused. The individual agencies now pay the Post Office about \$38 million a year. This is as it should be.

It is alarming to note, however, that to develop their usage figures so that they may reimburse the Post Office Department the agencies are spending almost \$3.8 million, equivalent to 10 percent of postage costs.

That is an example of the results of a change that we made at the request of the Hoover Commission. Here is the same Commission that requested the change be made, the Congress made the change exactly as the Commission requested, and the cost of taking the money out of one pocket and putting it into another pocket just on one item alone was \$3,800,000. That is a 10 percent increase.

HOOVER HAMBURGER FORMULA

If we use the Hoover hamburger formula for determining the savings in our national budget because of the Hoover Commission reports, we would say that instead of the Commission saving money, it is costing 10 percent more or \$6 to \$7 billion a year. These figures would be arrived at by arbitrarily considering that all of the Hoover Commission recommendations cost the Government 10 percent more by using the Post Office case as an example. Mr. Hoover arrived at the 60-year supply of hamburger for the Navy by the use of a trick formula that was no more deceitful and misleading than this one. It left the impression that the Navy had enough hamburger meat for 60 years. The truth was it had about 800,000 pounds, which would not be enough to last the Armed Forces over 1 day. After all, 800,000 pounds of

meat is the equivalent of only 400 good-sized steers. It is inconceivable to think that a quantity of meat the size of 400 steers, that could be corralled and kept on one part of the White House grounds, would be sufficient to last the great Navy or the Armed Forces 60 years. This is a sample of the ridiculous manner in which the high-powered public relations firms employed by the Hoover Commission have overdramatized and misrepresented the work and accomplishments but hid and submerged the devastation of the Commission.

HORRID EXAMPLES EXPECTED

March 10, 1954, Chairman Hoover stated in a speech at the National Press Club:

All the task forces are now in the midst of our inquiries and no horrid examples are ready for publication and no fine recommendations have as yet been put on paper; however, we are learning a lot.

At that time, Mr. Hoover expected his public relations task force to be able to disclose horrid examples.

An agency of the Congress would normally be expected to advise Congress first of any horrid examples and make sure that Congress was not reflected upon by overdramatization and also for the purpose of giving Congress an opportunity to correct any valid mistakes.

ADMITTEDLY A PRESSURE GROUP

The citizens committee for the Hoover reports in January 1955 published a document which was widely distributed to schools and universities in which it was stated:

For the first time in United States history, a pressure group has been formed to bring about a general reorganization. The citizens committee has kept the Commission's recommendations before the country and has not allowed them to be forgotten as such efforts have been in the past.

ALL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE GROUP ARE ADVERTISED AS TAX EXEMPT

It will be noticed the citizens committee admits it is a pressure group and its activities clearly disclose that it should be registered under the Lobbying Act. In the same booklet, it is stated that the Commission's influence was not limited to the national level. In 33 States and 2 Territories, little Hoover commissions have been established since 1949.

It was also stated in this booklet:

The citizens committee has operated as a pressure group against pressure groups.

DID MEMBERS TAKE OATH AS REQUIRED BY LAW?

On March 29, 1955, I addressed a letter to Mr. John B. Hollister, Executive Director of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, in which I asked for certain information. It is as follows:

Please advise me if the 12 members of the Hoover Commission take an oath as required by public officials to support the Constitution and laws of the United States, etc. Also please advise if the members of the staff likewise take such an oath.

If you will give me this information right away, I shall appreciate it very much.

On March 29, 1955, Mr. Hollister replied to my letter as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of today's date. All 12 Commissioners took the

oath of office the day of the first meeting of the Commission on September 29, 1953. This oath was administered by Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Burton. All the employees of the Commission take an oath of office before beginning their duties.

On March 30, 1955, I sent Mr. Hollister another letter, which follows:

I received your letter and thanks for the information about the 12 Commissioners and the employees of the Commission taking the oath of office.

Please advise me if the members of the task forces have also taken the oath and if their employees have likewise taken the oath.

Mr. Hollister's reply to my letter dated March 30, 1955, follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of today. All members of the task forces who draw any pay have taken an oath of office. Those who accept no pay are not asked to take an oath.

The task forces have no employees of their own. All staff who work with them are employees of the Commission.

Again on April 4, 1955, I wrote Mr. Hollister. My letter follows:

If you will give me a list of the members of the task forces who have drawn pay and who have taken the oath of office, as well as the list of those who have accepted no pay and, therefore, have not taken the oath, it will be appreciated very much.

If you can send it this week, please mail it to me here in Texarkana at Post Office Box 868, and oblige.

Mr. Hollister replied to my April 4, 1955, letter on April 8, 1955, as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 4, last. I could easily give you the

number of task force members who have drawn pay and taken an oath of office and also the number who have not. I am somewhat loath to give you the individual names, for I do not believe the Commission would feel that it should make any public distinction between the man who because of his own personal means, the willingness of his company to pay his expenses or his own excess of patriotic zeal does his work without remuneration and the man who does the work and draws all or part of what the Congress authorized him to be paid for his work.

I should be glad to discuss the matter informally with the members of the Commission if you would care to have me do so.

On April 11, 1955, I again wrote Mr. Hollister, and my letter follows:

Although I do not agree that the reason you have given is sufficient to justify withholding the information I have requested, I wish you would furnish me the number of members who served without pay or compensation, and therefore did not take the oath, and also the number of members who were paid and took the oath. After I get this information, I shall be very glad to talk to you about the other information, if I desire to pursue the matter further.

If you will furnish it to me right away, it will be appreciated.

The reply which I received from Mr. Hollister, dated April 13, 1955, is as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 11 last and hasten to enclose you a sheet which is attached to a progress report I am making to the Commission. This gives the breakdown of Commission personnel for September 30, 1954, and for each month, beginning November 30, 1954. This will give you the information you have requested.

Breakdown of Commission personnel

	Sept. 30, 1954	Nov. 30, 1954	Dec. 31, 1954	Jan. 31, 1955	Feb. 28, 1955	Mar. 31, 1955
Commissioners.....	12	12	12	12	12	12
Commissioner's assistants and secretaries.....	21	23	23	23	28	28
Staff personnel.....	28	30	28	34	37	39
Task force members with compensation.....	84	87	84	84	53	52
Task force members without compensation.....	77	78	77	77	92	83
Task force assistants and clerical personnel with compensation.....	213	211	211	152	149	124
Task force assistants without compensation.....	90	103	89	83	43	25
Total.....	525	544	524	465	414	363

The last letter I sent to Mr. Hollister, dated April 29, 1955, follows:

In your letter of April 13, 1955, you gave me information concerning the breakdown of Commission personnel. However, it does not give me the breakdown as to each Task Force.

I wish you would furnish me by Monday, May 2, at noon, the following information:

1. The name of each Task Force.
2. The number of members in each Task Force with compensation.
3. The number of members in each Task Force without compensation.

If you will please furnish this information to me by the time mentioned, it will be appreciated very much.

Mr. Hollister's reply to my April 29, 1955, letter, dated May 2, 1955, is as follows:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 29, which unfortunately did not reach me until after 10 o'clock this morning.

However, I am now sending you a statement along the lines you have requested.

Breakdown of task force members

1. Budget and Accounting Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation.....	0
b. Number of members without compensation.....	7
Total.....	7
2. Intelligence Activities Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation.....	3
b. Number of members without compensation.....	3
Total.....	6
3. Legal Services and Procedure Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation.....	9
b. Number of members without compensation.....	5
Total.....	14

Breakdown of task force members—Con.

4. Lending Agencies Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	1
b. Number of members without compensation	9
Total	10
5. Medical Services Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	15
b. Number of members without compensation	0
Total	15
6. Overseas Economic Operations Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	1
b. Number of members without compensation	8
Total	9
7. Paperwork Management Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	0
b. Number of members without compensation	5
Total	5
8. Personnel and Civil Service Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	4
b. Number of members without compensation	5
Total	9
9. Procurement Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	3
b. Number of members without compensation	10
Total	13
10. Real Property Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	5
b. Number of members without compensation	2
Total	7
11. Subsistence Services Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	0
b. Number of members without compensation	15
Total	15
12. Use and Disposal of Surplus Property Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	2
b. Number of members without compensation	7
Total	9
13. Water Resources and Power Task Force:	
a. Number of members with compensation	21
b. Number of members without compensation	5
Total	26
14. Committee on Business Organization of the Department of Defense:	
a. Number of members with compensation	5
b. Number of members without compensation	13
Total	18

Breakdown of task force members—Con.

Total number of members with compensation	69
Total number of members without compensation	94
Grand total	163

LAW ABOUT VOLUNTARY SERVICE TO GOVERNMENT

Title 31, section 665, of the United States Code, 1946 edition, contains the following excerpts:

Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government * * * except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

At the end of the paragraph, there is a heavy penalty for its violation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to have the special order granted him today put over until tomorrow.

EXTENSION AND FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1763) relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations," approved July 10, 1953 (67 Stat. 142), is hereby amended (1) by striking out "May 31, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1955," and (2) by adding at the end thereof of the following new sentences: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the chairman of the Commission shall have charge of the final liquidation of the affairs of the Commission after June 30, 1955, including the printing of reports, the payment of bills, the transfer of records and documents to the National Archives, and the disposition of furniture and other equipment of the Commission. The Chairman of the Commission shall designate such members of the staff of the Commission as he deems necessary for these purposes. Such liquidation shall be completed within a period of not to exceed 90 days after June 30, 1955, and the funds of the Commission shall remain available for necessary expenses during such period."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2581) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 8, 9, and 10, and insert "Component research facility for nuclear propulsion, improvements to an existing transonic tunnel, additions to two existing laboratory buildings, repairs and modifications to utility installations, and acquisition of not to exceed 500 acres of land, \$8,760,000."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "\$8,450,000" and insert "\$13,300,000."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "\$8,450,000" and insert "\$13,300,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATERS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2126, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, everyone is for this bill, and the only reason it is here on the floor today under a rule is because it authorizes the appropriation of an amount of money in excess of that which would make the bill proper for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. Chairman, the bill was favorably reported on by the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior report was favorably cleared by the Bureau of the Budget. The bill was unanimously voted out of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation and was unanimously voted out of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The rule granted on this measure took up something less than 10 minutes of consideration by the Committee on Rules.

The bill before you, H. R. 2126, is co-authored by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. Its predecessor act of 1952, which this bill amends, was coauthored by the gentleman from California, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Senator CASE, formerly a Member of this body.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, extends the operation of the Saline Water Act of 1952. The Saline Water Act of 1952 provided for research in the development and utilization of saline waters by providing for federally financed contracts to carry out the necessary scientific and engineering research to accomplish the desalting of sea water, saline and brackish water. In setting up that legislation in 1952, which carried with it an appropriation of \$2 million, and which has since that time been in operation, we were very careful not to provide for the Department of the Interior setting up a large scientific agency for the conduct of this research but rather for the coordination and correlation of the efforts of other Government agencies, of private industry, and of educational institutions.

The Interior Department was directed to carry out the research through contracts with private industry, with educational institutions, as well as to correlate the efforts of other agencies of the Government, such as the Navy Department, which had already gone into a good deal of experimentation in this field. The first program was to last a period of 5 years and, as I say, carried an appropriation of \$2 million.

Because these research contracts have to be executed some time prior to the end of the program, the last contract will have to be wound up by December of 1955 unless this act is extended. As a consequence, we are here today asking to extend this research program for another 5 years and to add \$4 million to the initial appropriation.

The results of the investigation and research up to the present time have convinced everybody connected with this program—the Interior Department, our committee, and the research scientists—that it should be continued. When this research program started, it cost between \$400 and \$500 an acre-foot as a maximum to reduce sea water to a condition which would make it fit for municipal, industrial, or agricultural use. The Interior Department set up as its initial goal reducing the cost to \$120 an acre-foot, which is about the top that can be paid for municipal use, and \$40 on brackish water for irrigation use.

The Interior Department informs us, and the representatives of the Department in their testimony before our committee said, that they are now within range of achieving those objectives; that is, of being able to reduce sea water—to reduce the salt in sea water—at a cost of \$120 an acre-foot and brackish water for irrigation use to a cost of as low as \$40 an acre-foot. I do not say that they have accomplished that yet, but they are within sight of that goal at the present time, and if they can continue with the same progress they have shown since this program started in 1952, it is a certainty that sea water will be made available at a cost for industry and municipal use that they can afford, and that brackish

water—large quantities of which exist throughout the western part of the United States and other parts of the world—will be made available to agriculture at as low as \$40 an acre-foot.

The present bill extends the period of this research for 5 years. It allows an additional \$4 million. The \$6 million mentioned in the bill is the total of the \$4 million plus the original \$2 million. It allows the use of approximately a half-million dollars for research in Federal laboratories. We did not permit that in the original act because we did not want the Federal Government getting into the field of research. We wanted that done by contract. But now we are getting to the stage of research where it is necessary for the Federal Government to evaluate the progress made by private industry and by the various educational institutions. Of course, each thinks his own is a little better and therefore the program needs some impartial group in the Federal Government to make a comparison of the various processes which are presently in the works. Half a million dollars is allowed out of the \$4 million for that purpose. That comes out of a limit of \$1½ million which the Department of the Interior can use for administrative purposes and for pilot-plant operation.

In short, we have strictly limited the amount of money that can be spent administratively or that the Government itself can spend on direct research. The rest has to be done in contracts such as has occurred in the program up to the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this is a research program that can have a tremendous and historic importance for the entire world. It can change the economics of the coastal areas of our country and the arid areas in the North American Continent. In addition, it can make great changes throughout the entire world. There are areas in the world today whose living conditions would be completely revolutionized if they could use sea water at a price which is economic.

This is the kind of research, in my opinion, that the Congress of the United States and the Federal Government should be willing to spend money on. It is the same kind of thing we did, for instance, on polio, except in a different field.

Whenever this kind of research is successful, it adds tremendously to the wealth and the growth of not only our own people but people throughout the entire world. When we consider the revolutionary effects that a successful conclusion of this research program may have, the money we are asked to put up for this research is a mere pittance, a small amount of money, indeed.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no opposition to this bill at the present time. It has a good purpose. It is sponsored and coauthored by men on both sides of this aisle, and I hope it will be passed without any difficulty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As I understand, this provides for a spending program of \$6

million over a 10-year period. Is that approximately correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is approximately correct. There is \$2 million already appropriated, which is being used and which has been mostly used up. This adds another \$4 million and extends the time 5 years, which would add up to what the gentleman says, \$6 million over 10 years.

Mr. GROSS. What are the States which will be directly benefited by this program? What are the States doing? What contribution are they making to this experimentation? How much money are they spending?

Mr. ENGLE. It is hard to say just what States will profit more than others.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will agree with me that California, for instance, will profit more than the State of Iowa?

Mr. ENGLE. Not necessarily. If Iowa has brackish water that can be cleaned up by this process and made fit for human consumption or irrigation, Iowa might profit, too.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we do not irrigate in the State of Iowa. Is the State of California, for instance, spending any money today on this sort of experimentation?

Mr. ENGLE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. GROSS. None of the other States, then?

Mr. ENGLE. Not to my knowledge. There is a bill pending presently in the State legislature of California to authorize the State of California's participation in this program, but I cannot tell the gentleman that the bill has passed. It has been introduced and is pending in the present session.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that I think it is worthy experimentation, but I still think that more of the States which would be most directly affected ought to be carrying some part of the load for this experimentation.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the gentleman that these States all ought to try to help themselves, but if we waited around to get them all together and get them all in it, it would be a long time before anything was done.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. What does the phrase "acre foot" of water mean? Does that mean 12 inches of rainfall over an acre of ground?

Mr. ENGLE. It means an acre-foot of water, which is an acre of ground a foot deep in water.

Mr. MASON. That would be 12 inches of rainfall on an acre of ground.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct, if it rains.

Mr. MASON. That costs \$40 an acre to change brackish water into water that can be used for irrigation purposes, if they accomplish their objectives.

Mr. ENGLE. They are aiming at \$120 an acre-foot for municipal water and \$40 an acre-foot for irrigation water. They think they can make it. They say they are within range of those targets now. Forty dollars an acre-foot is a lot, by the way, for irrigation, but in

some areas of California they do pay that much. On the other hand, with reference to municipal water where it is used for municipal purposes and industrial purposes, that can rather easily carry \$120 an acre-foot.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just want to add this brief statement in reply to the gentleman from Iowa. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and myself would both be very much in accord with the gentleman's idea that the States should enter into this cooperatively, but up to the present time there has been no opportunity for the States to spend money because the work has been experimental and has to be carried on at a different level. The gentleman from California should not overlook the fact that the University of California has been spending money and working on this experimentally—and that is State money.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true, and I should add that some of the Department of Interior contracts have been with the University of California and the Federal Government, therefore, has entered into a sort of partnership arrangement with the university.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. Would the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs agree with me that this is a broad and national program? It is not a regional program in any sense. Of the 24 contracts that have been let to date, the people doing the contracting are spread all over the country in places like Massachusetts at Yale University, Pennsylvania State College, Texas A. and M., and some of the field testing, for instances, has been done in inland States such as the States of Arizona and South Dakota, and the State adjacent to that of the gentleman from Iowa. So would the chairman agree with me that it is a broad national program from which all States and all areas of the country will benefit?

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. In recent years metropolitan areas on the cost line in the East as well as the West have found out that they had to turn down industries because they did not have enough fresh water to run those industries.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. WIER. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman, which touches upon the response of the gentleman from Arizona? As I understand it, there are 1 or 2 pilot plants that have spent all of their time on this work. The gentleman from Arizona pointed out that universities throughout the Nation have been experimenting in this field and carrying on the work on their own initiative. How many pilot plants have been spending full time on this objective?

Mr. ENGLE. There are no pilot plants currently in operation. They have not got up to the point yet where they can go into pilot-plant operation.

That is what this bill provides for. This bill provides money for pilot-plant operation. It provides half a million dollars. Therefore, under this legislation, there will be such pilot-plant operation.

Mr. WIER. How do you distribute this \$4 million in the future? Is it distributed to the universities or is there what I term a pilot plant where the work is being carried on? Do you distribute this to the various institutions?

Mr. ENGLE. Not except under the contracts as they were made with the Department of the Interior to carry on various phases of this research. Some of it is being carried on in one place and some in another, but on the pilot-plant operation, it is contemplated that the Department of the Interior itself will do that.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. In answer to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, there are three stages in this sort of work. First, the research laboratory, which has been taken care of up to this time to a certain extent. Next will be the pilot plant of which the gentleman speaks. This bill would provide for the establishment of one pilot plant, as we were advised. Then the demonstration plants, which would come later, and which would more than likely be the responsibility of the industry itself.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has explained very thoroughly the objectives of this saline water bill. It has been before the Congress for several years. It is a research bill, and this bill provides some additional funds which can be allocated to more than a score of universities for carrying on research work.

Now, what is research work? It is nothing more than asking questions of nature and trying to find the answer. Research has been carried on in many fields. In the medical field many diseases have yielded to research. In the field of animal diseases, the foot-and-mouth disease laboratory is being completed on Long Island, and the cause, cure, and treatment of foot-and-mouth disease in animals is being studied.

But here is a piece of legislation which says, Can we feasibly convert salt water into potable water? Water supplies of many communities and many cities are being jeopardized because of long-continued droughts. Some of those areas are along the seacoast where they have access to ocean water. If salt water can be made into potable water with a limited amount of expense, it should be carried on.

After all, water is worth what it costs when you are thirsty. Water is worth what it costs when you need it on irrigated land.

Here is a proposition that has for its purpose carrying on research and asking questions of nature to just find out how our salt water can be made into potable water.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the legislation here proposed parallel in great measure the legislation authorized by the Congress some years ago for the study of liquid fuels?

I just had the pleasure of attending the dedication of a pilot research plant for the study of liquid fuels located by the Bureau of Mines in connection with the University of the State of West Virginia at Morgantown. I assume what you are trying to do here is to handle this problem through a number of years of research, and that will require, as we have built in Morgantown, a pilot plant to carry on the necessary demonstrations. It is practically the same type of legislation, is it not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct. It is research similar to your oil research, and also wood research, and others that have been carried on. As I understand it, when the answers are found through the universities that have been working on the problem during the years, the University of California and other universities, then it is made available to private industry. The Government is merely an umpire, guaranteeing that there will be fair play. The Government is an umpire to insure that when these findings are made they can be made available to people who can then in turn make application of the facts found through research. There are great possibilities in this legislation, as there are in other research problems, such as the handling of oil shale in Colorado. I think we have made great progress, because we have billions of barrels of oil stored up in those shales, and now we know how to convert some of that oil into industry. I am satisfied that the experiments carried on in South Dakota and in Arizona, where pilot plants working on brackish water on a small scale have been carried on, have given us some valuable information.

I would hope that the Congress would pass this legislation and make the knowledge available to those who can use it in research.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think attention should be called to the method by which the correlation of research people and private industry is cared for in this legislation. When the program was instituted, the Secretary of the Interior appointed a group of nine eminent leaders, educational, scientific, and industrial organizations to provide him with the necessary information as to how the program should be carried on. Those gentlemen have been working since the institution of the program for no remuneration at all and very slight travel expense. That in itself tends to tie the everyday working operations right in to the area where the research scientists and investigators may later on make use of the information.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. If the gentleman will yield, may I suggest in connection with

this venture that the gentleman from Iowa, who raised the question about what Iowa would get out of it, that if you can get alkali out of the water in South Dakota and Nebraska that will be a great accomplishment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], a member of the committee.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I think the question has been very well covered by the distinguished gentleman from California and the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska. I would just like to make a few comments.

This, in my opinion, is a very good way for research to be handled, under Federal auspices; taking advantage of existing laboratory and university facilities, on a contract basis and then making the facts available to States, irrigation districts, cities, and individuals for further development of the program.

Another thing I would like to bring to the attention of the committee, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that this bill is not just merely one dealing with the purification of sea water: There is a lot of water in the United States of America today which is not potable because of the fact that it has a high saline content, and it is not confined to the waters which are in the oceans near our coasts.

In Arizona we have today a pilot plant operating on a well which belongs to the Buckeye Irrigation District. It is being operated under a contract through this very program. The water which comes from that well has a salinity content so high that it is very difficult if not impossible to use the water for the irrigation of crops. Through the operation of this plant at the present time the saline content of the water has been reduced to the extent that it may now be used for crops, and the whole area certainly will benefit because of that.

I want to mention also a problem that is a corollary to the problem of taking the saline content out of water. That is the disposal of the waste material. We have not yet been able to discover a means of disposing of this waste material which is taken from water in the desalinity process. That is a subject which must be gone into either in this program or in another separate program before we will really have any practical means of reducing the salinity of this water.

Furthermore, this is a universal program and not one which applies to one State or a group of States. I daresay that every State in the Union has some water which has too high salt content to be potable. I would call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that a few years ago the great State of New York was very short of water; in fact, water was being rationed and people were being urged to repair leaking faucet washers so water would not be wasted by dripping from faucets. It was a very serious situation.

So the shortage of water is not a phenomenon of the arid West; it exists throughout the United States today. If the predictions of certain scientists are true we may well be entering upon a dry cycle in the world's history. If this be

true, then certainly the Federal Government should do everything it can to attack and master this problem, which extends beyond State boundaries.

We have in many instances gone into programs which should have been conducted by the States and not by the Federal Government, but it was found necessary for the Federal Government to get into it in order to get the program off the ground to supply a need which exists and which is fairly universal throughout the Nation. I would consider the program of vocational rehabilitation to the physically handicapped to be in that category.

Certainly the primary responsibility for that program was on the State and local governments but where a need exists the Federal Government participates initially to get the program started, and provide the spark to get other echelons of government into the field. I hope the Congress in its wisdom sees fit to pass this legislation to give the States some impetus to get studies going in this field of endeavor. There is a great deal of national interest involved, since the need for potable water transcends State lines. It is hoped, by this research, that we can furnish States, irrigation districts, and private citizens of the country the first answers to the difficult questions involved, so they may go on from there to develop a practical system for removing salinity from water.

In the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs it was brought out very forcefully by Mr. Shepard T. Powell, that more than one system of taking this water and purifying it is needed. A system which works well in New York might not work out in Arizona or in California. So it becomes necessary that more than one system be adopted.

As far as means of furnishing power for the project are concerned, you will find that in the Western States where the sun shines without being impeded by clouds or trees too much, solar rays may be adaptable for the use of this particular project. In other States, of course, you will find that nuclear energy may be used at some time in the future. The whole program is just as broad as the scientific development of the United States in the last few years has been broad.

In order to cut the cost of this water down to where it can be used for agriculture, for industry, and for municipal purposes, a few more years of experimentation are very definitely indicated.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the House will pass this bill unanimously.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], who on several occasions has been the author of similar bills.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the field has been amply covered in reference to this bill. I should like to say I am very happy to have been coauthor of the legislation with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and I compliment him for the manner in which he has handled this bill both in the committee and in having it brought to the floor of the House at this time for con-

sideration. This is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been considered by this Congress and previous Congresses or will be considered by this Congress.

Coming from Ohio, I have had several ask me whether we have salt water out in Ohio. We do not have. However, I have traveled throughout my country and I have seen a serious situation in many States. I believe that the people of Ohio will want to see this situation remedied. It will be to their benefit both directly and indirectly.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out one thing that I do not believe has been covered. Private enterprise, private industry, throughout the United States has been working on this question for many years. Through this legislation we will be able to correlate the experiments being made by large industrial plants so that their plans and ours will be worked together and information distributed among those who are interested in the development of this system. Not only are the universities doing experimental work but private enterprise at its own expense through money that does not come from this bill or from the taxpayers is working to perfect various methods of desalting water.

It has been suggested that this is important to New York, and it certainly is. It is important in other ways, too. We have found in some cases that a system of desalting water purifies the water of atomic contamination. So if we develop the process we are working on, it can be used as a standby in those areas where water is taken from lakes and from reservoirs and purified, eliminating the effects of atomic fallout or atomic contamination.

Looking further into the future in reference to the question of fresh water, it seems to me we are making a contribution not only to our own country but to the world. Those who have traveled through the Middle East can readily see the possibilities. Take, for instance, Egypt, with her great areas of fertile soil but little good water, and plenty of hungry people. The development of this area may be possible through the installation of saline water conversion plants, thereby enabling water to be put on the land. We must also look forward, I think, within the very near future to atomic reactors which will be used in conjunction with this type of program. So we will be making a contribution not only to our own country but to the peoples of the world. We are not alone in this. Other nations are carrying on research. I think there is one nation, perhaps, that has gone a little ahead of us in the past in the development and perfection of these processes, but we are now working with the other nations of the world in this same study. It is so important not only to us but to others. We can think of our own possessions, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and other places, where it is so necessary to bring fresh water onto their lands in order that they may develop.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this legislation will pass and that it will have the full support of the Congress.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I come from a district in California, Los Angeles, which is vitally interested in the whole problem of water and particularly, I might say, Colorado River water at the present time. I think it would be well to make clear that our interest in this bill does not mean that the Members from California are any less interested in Colorado River water. Actually, I think there is very evident already conclusive evidence that the need for water in southern California will be such that Colorado River water alone will not fulfill our needs and that the processes which are under investigation and which will be conducted, I hope, under this bill will be needed if that area of the country is to continue to grow.

I think, however, it is also important to point out that it is possible, of course, if this process is eventually successful, that at some future time there can be less dispute, perhaps, or less opposition to sharing other available water supplies.

Mr. Chairman, I would very much appreciate the opportunity of asking the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], a question in relation to the coordination of this program between the Department of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission. As I am sure all of us realize, the success of this program on a commercial basis is largely dependent on whether or not low cost power can be had in sufficient quantities to make the process at a cost low enough to make it commercially feasible. I wonder whether there is any program that the committee knows about at the present time for coordination or cooperation between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of the Interior for the development commercially in various areas so that the two can be tied together.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would be delighted to have the gentleman read the statement on page 40 which appears in the report on the research program in our hearings on this matter before the committee which deals with the very subject matter that he has mentioned. The power or the heat to carry out the desalting process is the crucial element. Therefore, if atomic energy, for instance, could be used in generating the necessary heat or power to carry on this type of work under one or another of the processes which are being studied, then the opportunities of success are very much better. I assure my friend from California that the testimony indicates that there is close collaboration between the people in the Department of the Interior carrying out this program and its relationship to the development of atomic energy in the field of heat and in the field of power, because those are the two that are so essential to the success of this program. So, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, specifically the answer is yes, that that coordination is in progress and will be intensified.

Before I quit responding to the gentleman's inquiry, I would like to add my endorsement to what he has said with respect to whether or not this program has any particular applicability to the water claims of southern California on the Colorado River and to say to him that his statement in respect to that matter is exactly right. As a matter of fact, southern California is going to run out of water if it gets all the water that it claims on the Colorado River in between 13 and, as a maximum, 19 years, according to the information that I have. As a consequence, they have to get the water and they will either have to get it out of the sea or go over the Tehachapi Mountains and bring it down from northern California, from one of the rivers up there.

This does not affect southern California's position or the claims of the city of Los Angeles or any of the southern California water agencies upon the Colorado River whatsoever. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, so we can make it perfectly plain. The same can be said with reference to Arizona. It would not affect its claims, either, on the Colorado River.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would dislike to second the last remark of the distinguished chairman of the committee. Of course, this has nothing to do with the claims of either State regarding Colorado River water. I would agree with the chairman when he says that if southern California continues to grow at its present rate, there would not be enough water in the Colorado River to take care of its needs. I would say that would be equally true of the State of Arizona. This is a project which is certainly necessary for the future. I would like to say to my good friend from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that I am looking forward to the day when we can reverse the pumps on the metropolitan water aqueduct and bring purified sea water back inland into the State of Arizona.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and I join in his hopeful statement. I hope it will not be in the too far distant future. I thank the chairman of the committee very much for his very interesting statements.

I would like to point out for the record that at the present moment the Atomic Energy Commission is selling heat or energy generated by a reactor unit set up by the North American Aviation Co. Part of this heat has been contracted for, I believe, by the Southern California Edison Co.

I sent a telegram on Friday to the Los Angeles Bureau of Water and Power suggesting—as a public body I believe they have preference to whatever may be left over—that they should ask for the opportunity to get the balance of that generated heat. I hope that they will coordinate it, if it is possible to do so, under this law with a coordinated pilot plant in order that the two might go for-

ward together at this very critical place where I think we need it so badly.

I certainly hope this bill will pass.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes and then intend to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

I do this because I am pleased to see the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] bring up the question of the Colorado River and the possibility of desalting the water from the Pacific Ocean so that it may be brought back to Arizona. That would be an interesting process. But I think it is not beyond the realm of possibility under a properly conducted saline water research program.

With reference to the North American Aviation Co., they will probably shortly be given a contract to build an atomic reactor plant in the State of Nebraska using sodium graphite as the reactor. That is now in the works.

In connection with that, I would like to brag a little about the State of Nebraska. California is talking about some 15 or 16 million acre-feet of water that they have in the Trinity River. Nebraska has in its sand hills more than 600 million acre-feet of water, an adequate supply that needs only pumps. And we have 10,000 or more pumps tapping that underground supply of water. There is ample water to supply an atomic-energy plant. So when the North American aviation group builds their sodium graphite reactor plant in the State of Nebraska, all they need to do is dig a hole in the ground and the water will run out. There will be plenty of water that will not need desalting, good, fresh water, which I presume comes from Rocky Mountain area through underground streams before it reaches Nebraska.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, if I were to choose the two problems in the United States, of greatest importance to the people, in which the Government could interest itself I think they would be water and the conservation of land; that is, the conservation of water, the development of new sources of water, the use of water to its fullest capacity, just as we have now before us the problem of the conservation of land which has been washing away. In that way there is a certain similarity between the subjects, because we are wasting these two essential, and perhaps greatest assets that any nation could have.

As the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], said, I have been interested in this, and the RECORD will show I was one of the first to put in a bill to try to do something about it. I am still interested, and I know this bill will pass because of its importance.

I think the RECORD should show that it is a broad subject, that it is not entirely a question of taking sea water out of the ocean and getting the salt out of that, and then either putting it upon land or using it domestically. There is the question of the transportation of water. Some islands have been compelled

to use sea water, in dual lines, so they may conserve the fresh water and use the salt water for fire protection. The amount of fresh water that we put into the great cities of this country daily in the sewage disposal plants is unbelievable.

All of this is involved in the question of the use of sea water which has been rendered either pure or practically free from salt. It is only a beginning. I look for great advances, under the terms of this bill.

I am very much in favor of the bill. I know it will pass.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

CIO SPOKESMAN URGES QUADRUPLING OF FUNDS FOR SALINE WATER RESEARCH

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the noncontroversial nature of this legislation, I do not feel it necessary for me to take the time of the House to urge its enactment. I know it will be passed, and that the membership is convinced of the value of the research now being done in this field of converting salt water for irrigation and other purposes.

However, because of the widespread interest in the subject matter of this legislation, I do think it would be worthwhile to have as part of the record of the debate here, an excellent statement on the program generally, presented last month to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, by Joseph Applebaum, vice president of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO.

Mr. Applebaum, who has been a friend of mine for many years, has just recently moved from St. Louis to Denver, Colo., which is now his headquarters. In this matter, he testified in behalf of the National CIO, as well as his own union.

Mr. Applebaum endorsed wholeheartedly the objectives of the saline water program, and not only urged the extension of the program as provided for in H. R. 2126, but suggested that instead of an overall limit of \$6 million in preparations for this work, as provided for in H. R. 2126, that the ceiling be raised to \$25 million.

Because of the interest I know exists in this program, I include Mr. Applebaum's statement to the Senate committee, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH APPLEBAUM, VICE PRESIDENT, OIL, CHEMICAL, AND ATOMIC WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, CIO, TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, SALINE WATER PROGRAM EXTENSION, TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1955, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Joseph Applebaum. I am vice president of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO, with headquarters located in Denver, Colo. I am testifying here in behalf of the national CIO in support of the extension of the Government's saline water program.

Until recently, and prior to the merger of the Oil Workers International Union and the United Gas, Coke, Chemical Workers Union, I was western regional director of the United

Gas, Coke, Chemical Workers Union. In that capacity I appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture in Whittier, Calif., on November 12, 1953, in support of the further extension of the Government's saline water program. At that time I said, "CIO * * * today is happy to pay tribute to the great foresight of those legislators of the West who realize the great social and economic potential that lies in the sea at a time when no one else but a handful of scientists share their vision."

Since that time we in CIO have been impressed with the developments which have occurred in this field. We know that there has been proven a practicality to this program which now justifies the most optimistic hopes of our earlier testimony. We know that an application of vigor and intelligence can bring an early solution to many of our most pressing water-shortage problems.

Yet we stand here today in a period when the pressure of water shortage is an increasingly critical problem throughout the United States. In the past there have been occasions when it was safe to say that the water-shortage problem was primarily the problem of the West. With the passage of time, the growth of population, the increasing need for water in industry, agriculture, and for domestic use, it is now clear that water shortage is a national problem.

Therefore, gentlemen, it seems to me that the efforts of the past in solving this problem must be reexamined in the light of the new pressures, and steps must be taken to apply knowledge and technology which have been developed in this field in a more vigorous way looking toward the solution of this most pressing problem.

In the past week we have found general acceptance to a solution of one of the Nation's most pressing problems. The Salk vaccine may well end the fear of the dreaded disease polio. Given adequate funds and the application of trained technicians, we can solve some of our most serious problems. And no problem today is more serious than the growing shortage of water. Last week as I moved from St. Louis, my former home, to Denver, Colo., I experienced the effect of the snowstorm in eastern Colorado. This is one of the areas which has a critical water shortage. This storm, which delayed my trip, was greeted with jubilation in the eastern Colorado area. The more snow that fell the more water that would sink into the ground, the less the area would be affected by the scourge of the dust blow which is affecting this whole area. It is now taken for granted in the West that in the year 1955 this country will see the biggest dust storm in the creation of a new dust bowl with all its devastating effects covering 25 million acres.

Mr. Chairman, I propose that we immediately expand the Government's saline water program if for no other reason than to seek to end this menacing dust bowl condition, and that we provide the program with funds equal to \$1 an acre of the area affected, and that we call upon the scientists and the technicians and the irrigation experts to figure out ways and means of bringing an end to this condition brought about in such large part by the shortage of water.

Mr. Chairman, I said earlier we have been encouraged by the progress of this program. That is to say, we have been encouraged by the few experiments which prove that the program has developed a potential technology and an economic range of operation which can release the giant source of the ocean to meet the water needs of almost any area in the world.

The development of a power source known as the package reactor in the field of atomic energy means that we can now provide the technology of the saline water program to the most critical areas throughout the United States and the whole world, and use our developments in this field to meet the most

pressing needs of the underdeveloped countries of the world in their economic developments.

Mr. Chairman, the CIO believes that this program should be given a priority equal to that of our most pressing military development programs so that we can show the world that we are prepared to effectively aid them in raising their standard of living.

Recently the secretary of our National Committee on Resources Development drafted a memorandum on the Application of Atomic Power to the Demineralization of Sea Water for Irrigation or Domestic Use. Mr. Chairman, without reading this memorandum I would like permission to place it in the record at this point.

It shows, Mr. Chairman, that the direct power costs of the electrodialysis method of demineralization of brackish or sea water constitutes more than 50 percent of the total costs. But, it also shows the direct advantage which is gained from increasing the size of units involved. One million square feet of membrane area requires 1,600 kilowatt-hours per thousand gallons. Ten million square feet of membrane area reduces the power requirement to only 160 kilowatt-hours per thousand gallons. It is clear, therefore, that this program needs some immediate large-scale experimentation. It is likewise clear that we will never get the "bugs" out of the technology of this development until we try it in many places and on an increasingly larger and larger scale. Our technicians and the members of my own union have called our attention to the many places where this program can be immediately put to test. In some of the very areas affected by the dust bowl there are oil wells producing quantities of salt water which could be demineralized and used as potable water. The Department of the Interior's third annual report on saline water conversion says:

"The work accomplished so far indicates that attainment of the first goal of winning fresh water from sea water at a price which municipal users and some industries might pay, and the conversion of brackish water to irrigation uses, seems to be in sight although much work will be necessary before either can be brought to realization."

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, while I endorse the intention of S. 516 I recommend on page 2, line 5, the phrase "\$6 million in all" be stricken and in place thereof the committee substitute the phrase "\$25 million a year"; and in line 17, page 2, the figure "\$500,000" be stricken and in place thereof "\$5 million."

Mr. Chairman, the memorandum to which Mr. Applebaum referred in his testimony, The Application of Atomic Power to the Demineralization of Sea Water for Irrigation or Domestic Use, is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

From: Leo Goodman, secretary, CIO national committee on atomic energy, power, and resources development.

Re the application of atomic power to the demineralization of sea water for irrigation or domestic use.

MARCH 15, 1955.

There has been since 1952 an appropriation of \$400,000 a year for the saline water conversion program by the Congress to the Department of the Interior. The goal set for this program has been the reduction of acre-foot of potable water at a cost of approximately \$125. This is based on a survey of the cost of water to 400 American cities.

For irrigation purposes the objective has been production in cost to \$40 per acre-foot.

Substantial success has been achieved through the use of an ion transfer membrane demineralizer. This has been tested for both brackish water and sea water.

Brackish water in South Dakota has been demineralized at an estimated cost of \$4 per acre-foot predicated upon an estimated conversion plant installation cost of \$1,700,000, and salt content of 855 parts per million.

In Arizona, where the water contains 4,635 parts per million salt, the estimate is that brackish water can be made potable with a \$10 million investment and a cost of \$20 per acre-foot.

In Texas estimates run to \$40 per acre-foot in a \$20 million plant based on salt content of 10,000 parts per million. This process uses the property of certain plastic membranes to pass only electrically positive particles (cations) and other membranes to pass only electrically negative particles (anions). When salts are dissolved in water they break up into equal quantities of cations and anions which move in opposite directions in an electrical field. The power requirements to reduce salinity to approximately 350 parts per million were experimentally determined. The energy demand per gallon treated in a given sized unit was shown to be inversely proportionate to the production rate; that is, the higher the production rate the lower the energy consumption per gallon. In producing a water product with 350 parts per million salt content to produce 10 acre-feet per hour, that is salt content of 350 parts per million from sea water which contains approximately 35,000 parts per million is shown in the following table:

Membrane area: ¹	Sea water ²
1-----	1,600
3.3-----	480
10-----	160

¹ In million square feet.

² Kilowatt-hours per thousand gallons.

For each of the types mentioned above of the total cost per acre-foot the power cost was:

Type:	Total cost	Direct power cost
South Dakota-----	\$4.08	\$2.56
Arizona-----	19.53	10.34
Texas-----	40.07	22.60

The above estimates are based on the assumption of 0.3 cent per kilowatt-hour.

Using the above estimates the Bureau of Reclamation has concluded that portions of the southern California and Texas coastal regions where water requirements exceed present local supplies, and those which can be developed, it is physically possible to meet all the future water requirements of those areas with converted sea water. (Saline water conversion program, Research and Development Rept. No. 3, entitled "Potential Use of Converted Sea Water for Irrigation in Parts of California and Texas," p. 2).

The fundamental problem, therefore, is the lack of power in areas which need this program the most. Southern California and Texas do not have available the large blocks of surplus power which would be needed to make such a program feasible at this time.

It is proposed, therefore, that the Atomic Energy Commission build some of its experimental atomic-power reactors in these areas of sufficient size to supply the power necessary for further development of the saline-water program.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and compliment the committee on bringing out this bill at this time. It deals with the question of research and development in the problem of desalting water, a problem which is an important one throughout all the arid areas of the world. In many places the great salt ocean borders upon the lands. If that water could be uti-

lized, uncounted millions of acres could be brought into production. I think we should look at this thing realistically. I realize that this is not an event that will occur overnight. It may take several years. However, certainly, in view of the progress that has been made in the research and development and in reducing the cost of desalting water, we should proceed with those very modest research and development projects which are now in existence, and in my opinion we should increase them.

Last week this body passed a \$31.4 billion defense bill, thirty-one thousand millions of dollars. We are coming forward here with a very modest request for a total authorization of around \$6 million to be spent over a period of time. It seems that when we are spending so many thousands of millions for arms because of the troubled conditions of the world, we are certainly justified in spending a few million in the field of development of cures for some of the reasons for tensions in the world.

Undoubtedly, throughout the world not only in our own country, but throughout the world, lack of food is one of the great tensions that produce disquiet and unrest and eventually prepares the seedbed for the seeds of communism. If we could produce food in abundance in those areas of the world which now cannot produce it because of lack of water, this would be one of the very valuable results of such a program as this. I think it is a modest program and it is something which, I think, the House will approve. I commend the committee and ask for full support by my colleagues of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with those who have spoken in support of this bill. I represent a rather unique district in the State of California. We have 400 miles of coastline. Directly in from that coastline we have 400 miles of territory which desperately and urgently needs water. Anything that can be done along this line experimentally certainly will be most useful and beneficial not only to the State of California, but to the country as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328; 42 U. S. C., secs. 1951 ff.), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) By modifying subsection (a) of section 2 of said act so as to read: "by means of research grants and contracts as set forth in subsection (d) of this section and by use of the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories within the monetary limits set forth in section 8 of this act, to conduct research and technical development work, to make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs, and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operation."

(2) By modifying section 8 of said act so as to read: "There are authorized to be ap-

propriated such sums, but not more than \$6 million in all, as may be required (a) to carry out the provisions of this act during the fiscal years 1953 to 1963, inclusive, (b) to finance for not more than 2 years beyond the end of said period such grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and studies as may theretofore have been undertaken pursuant to this act, and (c) during the same additional period plus 1 more year, to correlate, coordinate, and round out the results of studies and research undertaken pursuant to this act. Departmental expenses for direction of the program authorized by this act and for the correlation and coordination of information as provided in subsection (d) of its section 2 shall not exceed \$1,500,000, and not more than \$500,000 shall be expended for research and development in Federal laboratories. Both of said sums shall be scheduled for expenditure in equal annual amounts insofar as is practicable."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUTUAL AID IN FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1006) to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes. I might say I have cleared this matter with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations and with the minority whip.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act—

(a) The term "agency head" means the head of any executive department, military department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government;

(b) The term "fire protection" includes personal services and equipment required for fire prevention, the protection of life and property from fire, and fire fighting; and

(c) The term "fire organization" means any governmental entity or public or private corporation or association maintaining fire protection facilities within the United States,

its Territories and possessions, and any governmental entity or public or private corporation or association which maintains fire protection facilities in any foreign country in the vicinity of any installation of the United States.

Sec. 2. (a) Each agency head charged with the duty of providing fire protection for any property of the United States is authorized to enter into a reciprocal agreement, with any fire organization maintaining fire protection facilities in the vicinity of such property, for mutual aid in furnishing fire protection for such property and for other property for which such organization normally provides fire protection. Each such agreement shall include a waiver by each party of all claims against every other party for compensation for any loss, damage, personal injury, or death occurring in consequence of the performance of such agreement. Any such agreement may provide for the reimbursement of any party for all or any part of the cost incurred by such party in furnishing fire protection for or on behalf of any other party.

(b) Any agreement heretofore executed which would have been authorized by this act, if this act had been in effect on the date of execution thereof, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

Sec. 3. In the absence of any agreement authorized or ratified by section 2, each agency head is authorized to render emergency assistance in extinguishing fires and in preserving life and property from fire, within the vicinity of any place at which such agency maintains fire-protection facilities, when the rendition of such assistance is determined, under regulations prescribed by the agency head, to be in the best interest of the United States.

Sec. 4. Any service performed under section 2 or section 3 of this act, by any officer or employee of the United States or any member of any armed force of the United States shall constitute service rendered in line of duty in such office, employment, or force. The performance of such service by any other individual shall not constitute such individual an officer or employee of the United States for the purpose of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended.

Sec. 5. Funds available to any agency head for fire protection on installations or in connection with activities under the jurisdiction of such agency may be used to carry out the purposes of this act. All sums received by any agency head for fire protection rendered pursuant to this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, a number of departments and agencies of the Federal Government maintain installations in the United States and other parts of the world which are located in or close to local governmental units and other organizations which maintain fire-protection facilities. It has been the practice for Federal agencies maintain such installations to enter into reciprocal agreements with local fire-protection organizations providing for mutual aid in fighting and preventing fires.

These agreements have proved very satisfactory to the Federal agencies concerned, particularly the military departments and the Veterans' Administration. By making arrangements to obtain the benefit of equipment and personnel available in neighboring communities, it has been possible to save substantial sums which otherwise would be required to provide and maintain additional Federal equipment and personnel.

In 1952, the Comptroller General expressed the opinion that payments to Federal employees for services performed in fighting fires on non-Federal property pursuant to a mutual-aid agreement would constitute an unauthorized use of appropriated funds unless it were shown that such services were necessary to safeguard Federal property. However, the Comptroller General stated that, in view of the protection secured to Government property by mutual-aid agreements which otherwise could be obtained only at greatly increased expense, the General Accounting Office would not object to the mutual-aid agreements with the understanding that the matter be presented to Congress with a view to securing legislative authority for such agreements.

S. 1006 is designed to carry out the recommendation of the Comptroller General. It would grant specific legislative authority to agency heads to enter into mutual-aid agreements with local fire-protection organizations and would ratify and confirm existing agreements.

No actual additional cost to the Federal Government would result from passage of S. 1006. However, if S. 1006 is not enacted and it becomes necessary to cancel existing mutual-aid agreements, the Defense Department alone estimates it would have to spend more than \$20 million annually for additional fire-protection personnel and equipment.

This legislation has the approval of the Comptroller General, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and the other agencies which are affected by its provisions. The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations unanimously recommended the favorable consideration by the full committee of an identical bill known as H. R. 6015. The Committee on Government Operations reported H. R. 6015 without a dissenting vote. The committee's report contains a more detailed explanation of the benefits to be derived from H. R. 6015 and from the identical Senate bill, S. 1006. Under unanimous consent, I include this report with my remarks:

AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS BETWEEN AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER AGENCIES AND INSTRUMENTALITIES FOR MUTUAL AID IN FIRE PROTECTION

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Government Operations, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Government Operations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6015) to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

H. R. 6015 would grant specific legislative authority to department and agency heads to enter into reciprocal fire-protection agreements with local governmental units and public or private organizations maintaining fire-protection facilities near installations under the jurisdiction of such heads within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, or in any foreign country. The bill would ratify and confirm existing agreements for such mutual aid.

Such reciprocal agreements for mutual aid in fire protection have been in effect for a number of years. However, the Comptroller General held in 1952 that, in the absence of specific congressional authority, the use of Federal personnel and equipment to fight fires on non-Federal property in accordance with such reciprocal agreements constituted an unauthorized use of appropriated funds.

The primary objective of this bill is to approve such mutual-aid agreements in order to enable the Federal Government to provide maximum fire protection for its installations and activities at a minimum cost through utilization of local fire-protection personnel and facilities on a reciprocal basis.

The bill would also authorize such agency or department head in the event of an emergency, in the absence of such reciprocal agreement, to make available Government fire-protection personnel and equipment to assist in extinguishing fires and preserving life and property threatened by fire in local areas at or near Government installations when such assistance is determined to be in the best interest of the United States.

BACKGROUND

Many Federal installations in the United States and other parts of the world are located in or close to municipalities or other local governmental units which maintain organized fire-protection facilities. It has been the practice of a number of Federal agencies to enter into reciprocal agreements with local fire-protection organizations near Federal installations providing for reciprocal fire-protection assistance. These arrangements have been very satisfactory, particularly to the military departments and the Veterans' Administration, which have a large number of Federal field installations under their jurisdiction. Federal agencies, by making arrangements to obtain the benefit of equipment and personnel available in neighboring communities, have been able to save substantial sums which would otherwise be required to provide and maintain Federal equipment and personnel.

In past years, mutual fire-protection agreements have apparently been entered into on the assumption that agency heads had implied authority to enter into such agreements and to expend funds pursuant to such agreements in order to carry out their duty to safeguard Federal property under their jurisdiction. In a decision of August 13, 1952, however, the Comptroller General disallowed overtime payments to Federal employees for services performed pursuant to a mutual-aid agreement in extinguishing a fire on non-Federal property. The Comptroller General stated that, in the absence of a showing that such services were necessary to safeguard Federal property, such payments would constitute an unauthorized use of appropriated funds. In concluding his decision, however, the Comptroller General said that in view of the value of the protection thus secured to Government property which otherwise could be obtained only at greatly increased expense, the General Accounting Office "will remove any exceptions still outstanding and raise no further objections to such mutual-aid agreements with the understanding that the matter be presented . . . to the Congress . . . with a view to securing legislative authority for such agreements."

In order to carry out the recommendations of the Comptroller General the Navy Department in 1954, after consulting with other interested agencies, proposed a bill authorizing such mutual-aid agreements. As S. 3773 of the 83d Congress, this bill passed the Senate on August 11, 1954. A similar bill, H. R. 10188, was introduced in the House of Representatives on August 5, 1954, but was not acted upon.

H. R. 6015 is substantially similar in purpose and effect to S. 3773 of the 83d Congress, although different language is used in H. R.

6015 in order more clearly to express the intent of Congress.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H. R. 6015

Section 1 defines the terms used in H. R. 6015.

Section 2 (a) authorizes agency heads to enter into reciprocal fire-protection agreements with local governmental units and public or private organizations maintaining fire-protection facilities near installations under the jurisdiction of such heads within the United States, its Territories, and possessions or in any foreign country. Each such agreement shall provide that the parties thereto waive all claims for loss, damage, injury, or death that may arise against each other in the performance of such agreement, and may provide for reimbursement for the cost of furnishing personnel and equipment pursuant to its provisions.

Section 2 (b) ratifies and confirms existing fire-protection agreements which would have been authorized had the act been in effect on the date of execution thereof.

Section 3 authorizes agency heads, in the absence of any agreement authorized or ratified by section 2, to render emergency fire-protection assistance near any place at which such department or agency maintains fire-protection facilities, when such assistance is determined to be in the best interest of the United States.

Section 4 provides that service performed under section 2 or section 3 by a Federal officer or employee or a member of any armed force of the United States shall be considered to be service performed in the line of duty, and that performance of such service by any other individual shall not constitute such individual an officer or employee of the United States for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

Section 5 authorizes the use of funds to carry out the purposes of the act, and provides that sums received by agency or department heads for fire protection rendered pursuant to the act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

ESTIMATED COST

The committee staff was advised by representatives of the Department of Defense that no actual additional cost to the Federal Government would result from the enactment of this measure. However, if the measure is not enacted, various agencies would be required to expend large sums of money for additional fire protection equipment and personnel. Thus, if any additional expenditure for Federal firefighters and equipment becomes necessary under these agreements it will be more than offset by the savings these agreements make possible.

In this connection, the Department of the Navy has advised the committee that, in the absence of such mutual-aid fire protection agreements, the Departments of the Army and the Navy would have to make an initial expenditure of approximately \$5,960,000, and an annual recurring expenditure of approximately \$19,820,000 for personnel and equipment. The Air Force estimates an initial expenditure of some \$20,000 and annual recurrent expenditures of approximately \$35,000 each for an unspecified number of additional companies which would be required.

The Veterans' Administration, with some 65 installations throughout the United States, estimates that without mutual-aid agreements it would have to make an initial expenditure of some \$75,000 and an annual recurrent expenditure of approximately \$1,250,000.

The Comptroller General has advised that the provisions of section 2 (b) and section 4 of the act would validate past payments of overtime compensation made to Federal civilian fire fighters who rendered services outside the limits of United States reservations in connection with mutual-aid agreements existing prior to the passage of this act.

Therefore, these provisions would also authorize retroactive payments in those cases where payments have not been made. However, the General Accounting Office states that it believes that "very few, if any, such payments would be involved" and that it does not object to the retroactive features of the provisions. Furthermore, in view of the explicit statement of the Comptroller General that the General Accounting Office "will remove any exceptions still outstanding and raise no further objections * * * with the understanding that the matter will be presented * * * to the Congress" it is doubtful if any retroactive payments would be involved."

AGENCY COMMENTS

In commenting on S. 3773 of the 83d Congress, a bill similar to H. R. 6015, the State Department said:

"The interest of the Department of State in the proposed legislation is limited to the extent to which it would permit the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to conclude mutual-aid agreements regarding fire protection, with foreign governmental units, such as municipalities and other political subdivisions of foreign states. From the standpoint of the foreign relations of the United States the Department perceives no objection to the military authorities concluding such agreements on the local level and would interpose no objection to the enactment of the proposed legislation."

The Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the Department of the Interior also recommended passage of S. 3773.

The Veterans' Administration expressed an opinion that the provisions of the proposed legislation might extend line-of-duty coverage to Government employees whose assistance in fighting fires was neither requested nor desired. However, the committee believes as does the Comptroller General, that the legislation provides sufficient safeguards to prevent undue liability to the Government and at the same time makes it possible to utilize the services of other than fire-fighting personnel. After calling attention to the above reservation, the Veterans' Administration stated that the legislation "would afford a means of obtaining maximum protection of human life and Government and other property at a minimum of cost. The Veterans' Administration strongly recommends its favorable consideration."

The Department of the Navy advised that "the benefits derived through mutual fire assistance have, without question, been overwhelmingly in the Government's favor * * *. Favorable action on the proposed legislation to authorize reciprocal fire protection agreements between military departments and public or private organizations, providing for mutual aid in extinguishing fires, is considered to be highly desirable."

The Department of the Air Force stated that it "strongly supports this legislation which would authorize reciprocal fire-protection agreements between departments and agencies of the United States and public or private organizations engaged in fire-fighting activities."

The Department of the Army advised that unless legislation clearly legalizing mutual-aid fire protection agreements is enacted, it would be necessary to cancel present agreements for such mutual aid. The Department stated that "this would be detrimental to both Government and civilian communities with the additional personnel and equipment needed to maintain protection of the caliber now provided resulting in greatly increased expenditures by the Government."

The Department of Agriculture advised the committee it favored enactment of this legislation since the authority provided "would facilitate the protection of forest and range resources from fire. One feature * * * of particular interest to this De-

partment at the present time is the provision for international agreements. Exercise of this particular authority would be primarily in connection with fire protection in the national forests and other lands under the administration of the Department of Agriculture, bordering on or near Canada where at present no authority exists for reciprocal aid agreements."

The Bureau of the Budget recommended favorable consideration of this legislation.

The Comptroller General stated that the legislation "would supply the statutory authority which the Comptroller General has held is necessary for the use of Federal appropriations for mutual aid by the Federal Government and local public or private organizations for fire protection of public and private property * * *," and recommended favorable consideration.

SUMMARY

The enactment of H. R. 6015 would:

1. Meet the objections of the Comptroller General to making payments to Federal personnel for services rendered in fighting fires outside Federal property and to using Federal equipment in fighting such fires when such payment or use is pursuant to a mutual-aid agreement.

2. Result in a substantial saving by making the purchase and maintenance of additional equipment and the hiring of additional personnel unnecessary.

3. Authorize fire-protection assistance in the vicinity of Federal fire-protection facilities in emergencies and when there is no mutual-aid agreement, where such assistance is in the best interest of the United States.

4. Meet with the approval of the Comptroller General, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense and other agencies which are affected by its provisions.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(By unanimous consent (on a motion of Mr. FOUNTAIN), a similar House bill, H. R. 6015, was laid on the table.)

MINNESOTA CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATIVE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my distinguished colleagues from Minnesota in offering a bill today to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union.

When our State came into full partnership in the Union on May 11, 1858, it was already a thriving, progressive Territory, rich in resources and richer still in the enterprise of its people.

While glancing through the "One Hundred Years Ago" column of the nearby Virginia newspaper, the Alexandria Gazette, recently, I came upon this item from its issue of February 8, 1855:

The progress of Minnesota Territory is truly wonderful. It was organized only 6 years ago. Thirty counties have since been laid off and nearly all are organized. The population has increased from 5,000 to 30,-

000 or more. The taxable property of the Territory is estimated for 1855 at \$7 million. A wire suspension bridge has been thrown over the Mississippi River above the falls of St. Anthony.

This must have been exciting news from the wilderness for the people of Alexandria, the kind of news that led new immigrant pioneers to accept the challenge of carving an empire from the tangle of lands and streams and lakes.

This short passage from one of the great eastern newspapers of the time gives us a clue, I think, to Minnesota's greatest asset when it was admitted to the Union 3 years later—and still her greatest asset—the spirit of hard work.

The pioneers who migrated to Minnesota were not primarily the debtors, heretics, or persecuted who founded so many of our other great States. They were people looking for a home and economic well-being. They came for furs, for lumber, for farms, and finally to build factories.

Under the flags of France and England and Spain, men came to test our unmapped geography and unknown resources. After the Louisiana Purchase and after the British relinquished claim to the Red River Valley, all of Minnesota came under the dominion of the United States.

Americans arrived to stay in 1819 with the founding of Fort Snelling at the confluence of the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers. Behind the troops came the enterprising Yankees of the 1830's. Along with the Yankees, in the early 1850's, came the Germans, the Irish, and the Scandinavians. All of these people shared a genius for thrift and hard work.

They set about building farms and towns. They started fur and lumber industries. They turned from the steamboat to cutting roads and building railroads. In the doing they suffered loneliness and back-breaking work, privation and suffering, but most of them stayed on.

Significantly, they dotted the land with churches and schools.

All of them—the Yankees, the Germans, the Irish, the Scandinavians—shared a deeply rooted respect for education along with hard work.

With the Territory only 2 years old, a Territorial legislative committee in 1851 called for the establishment of a university.

The committee's report said that—

The cause of education in the Territory demands the early establishment of an institution of learning, which shall afford to the youth of the Territory an opportunity of obtaining a liberal, scientific, and classical education. * * * Men do not "gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles," neither does society grow virtuous citizens from haunts of vice, or exalted minds from the abodes of ignorance and stupidity.

Wisely, the committee went on to say:

To govern and restrain the ignorant is far more difficult than to educate and fit men to govern themselves.

Thus 7 years before Minnesota became a State, the Territory chartered the University of Minnesota.

The story of Minnesota's growth and development is really a story of the spirit.

More than its resources, the thrift and hard work of its sturdy pioneers mark the reason it thrived and grew into a State of rich and varied opportunities.

The descendants of these settlers still farm the land and work the factories with the same determination to make a home and a way of life out of the resources God has given them. They have preserved the same genius for thrift and hard work.

A hundred years is not a long time in the history of man. But the history of a State is the story of millions of men who lived there in a hundred years, each adding to the great heritage we will commemorate in 1958.

The Minnesota story is a fascinating one, and I wish, Mr. Speaker, that we could tell you more of that story today. We are proud to be part of this great country and therefore are asking you to join with us in marking our 100th year in the Union.

The commemorative coin is only a symbol, but through it the Congress, the Federal Government, and our State exchange appropriate respects on 100 years of happy association.

We hope, too, that all of you will visit us during the centennial year to share more personally in this patriotic celebration to demonstrate our genuine gratitude to the United States as a proud member of the Union.

HOOVER COMMISSION STUDY OF WATER RESOURCES AND POWER

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, a task force of the Hoover Commission has completed a study of water resources and power. This is the largest single project of the Hoover Commission. The membership of the task force comprised some 26 persons including various advisers. The staff hired by the task force numbered some 46 at the peak. Approximately 1½ years were devoted to the investigation and preparation of the report. The task force will have expended, when the printing is completed, more than \$400,000 to make this study. These are taxpayers' dollars appropriated by the Congress. I believe that the taxpayers are entitled to know what are the findings and conclusions of the Hoover Commission task force.

Who appointed the task force to make this expensive study? Not the Congress of the United States. The 83d Congress, under a Republican majority, authorized the creation of the second Hoover Commission, just as the 80th Congress, with a Republican majority, authorized the creation of the first Hoover Commission. But Congress did not authorize the creation of a series of satellite commissions known as task forces. So far as I can ascertain, the task force on water resources and power was appointed by Mr. Hoover himself.

Mr. Hoover's views on Federal power development are no secret. He has stated them in speeches and in his memoirs. Why should the public have to pay more than \$400,000 to get a documentation of Mr. Hoover's power philosophy?

But the money has been spent and the study has been made. This study should be made public at once so that the people of the United States can find out what new skulduggery is afoot. Considering the composition of the task force, and of the Commission itself, I do not find it difficult to surmise that the task force report on water resources and power will be the giveaway to end all giveaways.

I realize, of course, that the Hoover Commission itself may modify some of the findings of its task force. Nevertheless, the public funds were expended directly by the task force. Its voluminous report undoubtedly will be the bible of the private utilities for years to come.

The release of this report by the Commission will not interfere with the Commission's preparation of its own report. Indeed, the Congress and the public will be better able to appraise the Commission's report if it has a sufficient opportunity to examine the task force report.

Unless the task force report is made public now, probably we will not have an opportunity to see it until the Hoover Commission is about to disband and the Congress is about to terminate its session. The Hoover Commission is slated to terminate May 31, or June 30 if a requested extension of 1 month is granted by the Congress.

The Commission is supposed to be an advisory group to the Congress. Why should the Congress have to wait so long for a completed study? Why all the secrecy?

I hope that other Members of Congress will join me in demanding that the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power be made public at once.

THE LATE MICHAEL E. HENNESSY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks on the death of Michael E. Hennessy, an outstanding newspaperman for 60 years, and to include as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Boston Globe of May 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, one of the outstanding members of the profession of journalism, one of its leading figures for many years, Michael E. Hennessy, of Boston, Mass., passed on to his great reward. For over 60 years Mr. Hennessy was connected with the Boston Globe, Boston, Mass.

For many years, wherever correspondents and newspapermen met, and Mr. Hennessy was present, he was always recognized as the dean of those present. He enjoyed the confidence and respect of everyone, either in or out of public life. To those occupying public life, he enjoyed their friendship and their confidence, no matter how high and exalted

or how small their position might be. Possessing great power as he did by reason of his position and standing in his profession, Mr. Hennessy always exercised it constructively, for he was a builder in public opinion.

The private and professional life of Mr. Hennessy was exemplary—above reproach, and an inspiration for all others to follow. He lived up to the highest and noblest traditions of his profession. His profession is ennobled by the contributions made to it by him during his lifetime.

In the death of Michael E. Hennessy, or "Mike" Hennessy, as he was so endearingly termed, his countless friends have lost a valued friend. His profession has lost one of its finest assets. Mrs. McCormack and I, who enjoyed his friendship for many years and who valued it very much, have lost a personal friend.

To his loved ones left behind, his two daughters and son, their father and my late friend has left to them a heritage that in their grief and sorrow will always be a consolation to them, and an inspiration for them in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks an article on Michael E. Hennessy appearing in the Boston Globe of May 13, 1955, as well as a letter to him from the late James Morgan, appearing in the same issue:

THERE WAS NEVER A BITTER LINE IN MIKE HENNESSY'S POLITICAL WRITINGS

A unique type of personality in American journalism takes leave, with the passing of the Globe's Mike or Colonel Hennessy, as thousands of friends and admirers in New England and all over the country called him.

The high qualities of Mr. Hennessy's character and abilities, and the values of his practically lifelong labors in the reportorial profession are perhaps best epitomized in four testimonials to him:

When friends gathered 'round the festive board at a Boston luncheon to the colonel on his 73d birthday, President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent the following greeting:

"My hearty congratulations and all good wishes on your birthday. I hope that for long years to come you may continue to exemplify those rare qualities of a good reporter—honor, honesty, and alertness—which make you a veritable landmark in American newspaperdom. May your shadow never grow less."

And for a similar observance arranged by friends on the day that Mr. Hennessy was passing his 80th milestone in life, President Truman's salutary letter read:

"DEAR MIKE: A wonderful thing it is to reach the fourscore mark after 57 years of active service with the Boston Globe, and eyes still on the future, the best yet to come.

"There are few newspapermen more familiar with national politics than you—few who have enjoyed a larger acquaintance with political leaders or been honored with fuller confidence.

"I salute a hale veteran still serving with distinction in the profession of journalism—admired by all, beloved by many."

LAUDED BY COLLEAGUES

The late William Allen White, sage of Emporia and as publisher of that Kansas city's famed Gazette, an unfailing attendant was Colonel Hennessy at every quadrennial convention of the major political parties since 1900, also held Mr. Hennessy in high regard.

Frederic William Wile, clever foreign correspondent after wide service with the Philadelphia Public Ledger, addressing the Boston

Chamber of Commerce 1 day a quarter century ago, praised Mr. Hennessy as "one of the most skillful gatherers of Washington news that any paper has," and added:

"I am a bold man to come to Boston to talk to you about the situation at Washington today when Boston has a correspondent like Mike Hennessy, who flares like a flaming comet across the political firmament at Washington."

These hearty testimonies to Mr. Hennessy's personal and professional worthiness were to be reinforced through the years by countless others from lesser lights in politics, in newspaper work in ecclesiastical circles, in business—but all were of the same refrain. A Boston newspaper dean who had followed his stories from the earliest lately remarked that in 60 years of Hennessy writings "there was never a mean line."

ALL IN GRACEFUL STRIDE

The colonel took it all in graceful stride—none of these or other praises ever swelled the size of his head or swerved his fingers on his trusty typewriter. As the principal speaker at one of his own recent birthday shindys (as he called them), Mike, with his wonted modesty, told his friends in a few well-chosen words: "I thank you with all my heart. I am grateful that you should come in a busy hour of the day to help me celebrate an event in my life. Lowell said, 'He who has a thousand friends has not one friend to spare.' I thank those who have arranged this dinner, for I prefer an ounce of taffy while I'm alive to a pound of epitaphy when I'm dead."

Along with his keen mind, his alertness for political news, his soundness of judgment upon its values and his unfailing sense of fairness in setting it forth, Mr. Hennessy had a strong instinct for sociability. With this trait went a lively humor, which made him ever a well-remembered figure to the lowly he met in his daily rounds, no less than to men and women of distinction in the world of politics.

Mr. Hennessy began flourishing as a reporter at the big conventions and as a commentator on figures on the national stage, soon after getting his primary schooling covering on the Globe staff in the old Federal Building. Those were days when Democrat Leverett Saltonstall (Senator SALTONSTALL's grandfather) was Grover Cleveland's collector of the port here. Afterwards, Mr. Hennessy was for many years the Globe man at city hall and then at the State house.

FROM GROVER CLEVELAND TO TRUMAN

Thus, beginning with President Cleveland in the days when sturdy Grover summered at Buzzards Bay, Mr. Hennessy had been on cordial terms with every President and Vice President in all the intervening years up to Mr. Truman—and with many a Cabinet officer, governor, Senator, member of the judiciary, and miscellaneous others in high place. Candidate Dewey greeted him as Mike after a little chat between them had established the fact that their maternal ancestors had been reared in Clonakilty in Ireland.

Mr. Hennessy had traveled with most successful presidential candidates on campaign tours. The long perspectives which his journalistic experiences gave him, plus his studious reading of the Nation's political history and his ready knowledge of the record sources made him a quick-reference judge on questions pertaining to individuals, or facts and figures in the never-ending game of politics. He was a tireless, keen-eyed, fast-witted watcher of the political parade—he saw them come, and saw them go, and never lost his head and the vast majority of those he met respected him deeply.

There is the tale from one of Mr. Hennessy's local journalistic buddies about a visit to Boston of Dutch-ancestored President Theodore Roosevelt. Spotting the

ample figure of Mr. Hennessy waiting in a corridor for the interview, the President hopped down the steps two at a time, grasped the reporter by both hands and started a jig, chanting:

"The Irish ain't much,
The Irish ain't much,
But a darned sight better
Than the damned old Dutch."

President Taft, on tour or in a White House press conference, always would make much of Mr. Hennessy. He crossed the continent with President Wilson on that last fateful campaign trip, and when the latter broke with Secretary Joseph F. Tumulty, Mr. Hennessy continued his close friendship with Joe.

Mr. Hennessy had by bad luck missed "making" at Plymouth, Vt., the special train bearing President Coolidge Washingtonward after he had taken the oath by lamp-light. But by rare good luck he did catch up with, and boarded the train at Bennington.

Mr. Coolidge had inquired for Mr. Hennessy en route, and when told that Hennessy had wired that he would be at Bennington to join the party, the President remarked to his informants: "We ought to hear his chuckle by this time, if he's there, hadn't we?"

President Franklin Roosevelt, on many an occasion, manifested his esteem for Mr. Hennessy, as did Gov. Alfred E. Smith, James F. Byrnes, James A. Farley, John N. Garner and Alf Landon. All of them completely trusted him.

And for his mellow wisdom and his unfailing good humor, the "colonel" was as popular with his coworkers across the country in the journalistic vineyard as he was with the politicians. His distinguished colleague—the Globe's James Morgan—cites a typical demonstration of the affection in which they held him.

At the Chicago convention which gave Franklin Roosevelt his first nomination in 1932, assembled newspapermen from all corners of the country were waiting for their first press conference on that occasion with Al Smith, when Mr. Hennessy hove in sight to join it.

It was his first appearance among his fellows at the big show, and Mr. Hennessy received cheers as loud as if he himself were a candidate. They welcomed him because they knew that he could be depended upon to discount the noisy hoopla, sift the lurid rumors, and somehow keep close to the developing facts in that convention, as he had in so many before.

At one Republican national political convention, a Globe man rode in a hotel elevator with Henry L. Mencken, noted Baltimore Sun writer.

"Where's Mike Hennessy?" Mencken asked the Globe man. He was told that Mike was not able to make the convention; that he was at home.

"It ain't legal," exclaimed Mencken.

Mr. Hennessy's sociability was recognized by his Bostonian coworkers as early as 1911, when he was elected president of the old Boston Press Club, the year of its silver anniversary.

HEADED CLOVER CLUB IN GOLDEN YEAR

A more marked honor in this line came to him in 1933, when he was chosen president of the Clover Club of Boston at its golden anniversary. For several years before that he had been this organization's secretary, and had assisted actively in arranging the bright, breezy, and educational programs at its seasonal dinners.

For this social side of his life, as for his articles, Mr. Hennessy had a great fund of anecdotes and humorous yarns. This was the style of material which enlivened his column in the Sunday Globe Round About With M. E. Hennessy, and shone out over the years in his topical news stories on the

passing political scene. Many of his fans remember to this day some such stories from his series of weekly broadcasts under Globe auspices from station WEEI in 1935.

Out of his personal newspaper experiences and the jottings of his prolific notebooks, Mr. Hennessey found the energy and the time to produce political volumes which remain today as standard records; the first, on the epochal Massachusetts constitutional convention (1917). The second 7 years later, was titled: "Calvin Coolidge—From a Green Mountain Farm to the White House." In 1935, he revised his earlier-written record of Four Decades of Massachusetts Politics, spanning the stretch between the great Democrat William E. Russell and Representative Samuel W. McCall—so bringing that volume up to date with the Curley regime on Beacon Hill.

AN AMERICAN WITHOUT A HYPHEN

Although Michael Edmund Hennessey was racially Irish to the very core of his heart, he was patriotically an American without a hyphen. While both his parents were natives of the Ould Sod, 'twas in London that he was born, October 24, 1866. For all his traveling on this continent, he was not to set foot on Ireland until 1926. Mr. Hennessey had interviewed Eamon de Valera when that foredestined leader first came to Boston in the twenties—so on that visit to Ireland, he and Mrs. Hennessey were shown around as well as you may imagine for a de Valera Cook's tour.

And at "Dev's" more recent visit to Providence and then to Boston, "Mike" was along with him.

Mr. Hennessey's parents were in process of migration to America at his own birth in London. They brought him across in his ninth year, settling in Jamaica Plain. Brother Mike attended Mount Vernon Grammar School, West Roxbury, when that now very populous residential region was all remotely rural from the city in which he was to win distinction. Later, he attended Eliot Academy, Jamaica Plain.

After cub training on the West Roxbury Advertiser, he went to work for the old Yankee-controlled Boston Record-and-Advertiser. In 1889, he joined the Globe staff. A year later, he married pretty Catherine E. Sullivan, of Charlestown. They settled at 46 Gardner Street, West Roxbury—and from the first days onward, his generous heart and her gracious spirit made that home remarked for its hospitality. This was to remain the family home through all the years. Mrs. Hennessey died in 1940.

Among Mr. and Mrs. Hennessey's five deceased children was James Morgan Hennessey, who for several years was secretary to the late William D. Sullivan (then the Globe's managing editor).

He is survived by two daughters, Anna G. and Kathryn Sullivan Hennessey, both of West Roxbury.

LETTER FROM MR. MORGAN, THEN 92, TO M. E. HENNESSEY ON REACHING 87

OCTOBER 22, 1953.

CARO MICHELE: Your being a kid of only 87 is no subject for congratulations by me. Rather, I am congratulating myself on the lengthening of the great and precious friendship you have given me through near two-thirds of your life.

Always I see with the eye of memory a young chap who brought in an interview with Ben Butler, wherein he endorsed Russell for governor. As Ben was not noted for a forgiving and forgetting disposition, I doubted his approval of a son of an anti-Butler father, and I asked you to take a proof of your interview back to him for verification. You returned it with his immaterial corrections scrawled in the margin, and that proof still is among my keepsakes.

That was the first and the last time I questioned anything you have written in the some 6 and 60 years that I have summered and wintered with you. Nor have I a recollection of anyone ever challenging your accuracy, though you were in the thick of the political battle for an epoch.

Before you were done roving, with that notebook in which naught was set down in malice, there was no member of the American press more widely known and liked than you from coast to coast. Friend of Presidents and proletarians, you are the best anecdote I know, and many of my most interesting stories of public men I stole from you. Laurence once grumbled that he had to make himself known all over again at every meeting with people at the conventions, but that it was "Hi Mike," with them at every sight of you. Somehow you etched on the minds of all you met the impression of an unforgettable personality. I mind the time that your fellow passengers either stayed up or got up to give you a sendoff at Cobh at an ungodly hour in the morning.

Helen and I are most indebted to you for our acquaintance with the rare beauty of your home life. You have been called upon to endure more than your share of family bereavements but you have borne them as gallantly as you have these long years of separation from the queen of your heart. Fortunately, you have the devotion of the two daughters who are so admirably qualified to carry on the tradition of their mother's gracious hospitality.

You and I have not kept books on each other. But I know that a balance sheet would disclose me hopelessly in debt to you who is happier in giving than in receiving.

United love and good wishes from Cousin Helen and me to you and yours.

JAMES MORGAN.

MICHIGAN WEEK

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, starting this past Sunday, May 15, and continuing through to the following Saturday all Michiganders will observe Michigan Week. I should like to extend to my colleagues here an invitation to join us in our week-long trumpeting about our great State. If the members of the Michigan delegation are seen stalking about with an increased air of pomp and elegance, I would ask the indulgence of your collective understanding for our proud behavior in the coming few days.

I am sure that the Members of this House are equally proud of their home States, and that they, too, have allocated given days of the calendar to bringing public recognition and observance of the many attributes of their State. It is right and proper that we vigorously maintain our singular identity of individual statehood, and staunchly pursue our separate objectives within the framework of our federally constituted Government—for in our diversity we have uncovered the strength that this unselfish individuality affords.

MICHIGAN'S SPIRITUAL FOUNDATION

Each day of this week will have a special significance. Yesterday, Sunday, was designated "Michigan Spiritual Foundations Day," which was devoted to

the recollection of the spiritual basis of religious and patriotic values that are fundamental to our system of State government. Our great State has had a particularly close bond with religion. A great deal of the early pioneering settlements of our Upper Peninsula were the results of devoted Catholic missionaries such as Father Jacques Marquette, who found Michigan's first permanent settlement at St. Ignace in 1670. The first Territorial representative to the Congress was the much revered Father Gabriel Richard, the cofounder of the University of Michigan. Yes, the spiritual foundations of Michigan were indelibly recorded by the courageous and dedicated pioneerings of the religious missionaries, who ventured forth unafraid into the unknown in search for the freedom and opportunity that is not afforded by the intolerant. The heritage of Michigan is one of love—love of freedom, love of opportunity, and, most of all, love of God.

EXCHANGE OF MAYORS

Today, Monday, has been designated "Exchange of Mayors Day" for the purpose of promoting better understanding between the peoples of the local villages and cities. By viewing at first hand the community problems of your neighbor, the barriers of misunderstanding are sure to collapse when the spirit of good-neighborliness prevails.

Tuesday, May 17, will be "Michigan Hospitality Day," a day set aside for emphasizing the wealth of attractions that our State holds for the perennial tourist. The natural friendliness of Michigan people is sure to make any visit a memorable one.

EDUCATION

The following day, Wednesday, May 18, is Education Day. The important role that education has played in our State's growth and development will be highlighted by the convening of the White House Conference on Education. Our State has long been a leader in the important field of education. Its educational system has been used as a model in nearly all the Western States. Michigan stands third in the number of students enrolled in institutions of higher learning. Founded in 1817, the University of Michigan is regarded as the mother of State universities because of its leadership in the development of State-supported higher education. Michigan State College, now celebrating its centennial, was the first agricultural college in America. The University of Detroit, my alma mater, is one of the largest Jesuit universities in the world. As has been said of the British Empire "that the sun never sets on England's possessions," so it has been said of the work of the Holy Order of the Society of Jesus. Its present president, Father Caelstin Steiner, is a recognized leader in the field of Catholic education. Just recently the University of Michigan was the site of the historical medical victory achieved by Dr. Jonas E. Salk over the polio virus. The efforts of our State in the field of education emphasizes our belief that knowledge is power and the greatest deterrent to the evils of ignorance and suppression of the truth.

OUR LIVELIHOOD

This coming Thursday, has been chosen as Our Livelihood Day. On this day all Michiganders will reflect upon the diversity of means by which the people of the community make their living. The paramount manufacturing industry of our State is, of course, the automobile. From Detroit comes over one-half of the Nation's total production of passenger cars. Over 1 million persons are employed by Michigan's 10,000 factories. Michigan ranks first in percentage of income derived from manufacturing. But, Michigan, is also a great agricultural State as well. Michigan is the most self-sufficient food producer in the Nation. It leads the country in production of sour cherries, navy beans, cantaloupes, celery, cucumber pickles, and strawberries. The richness of our natural resources is attested to by the following facts: The only large commercial deposit of native copper in the world is located in Michigan. Michigan has more forest land than any other State: 937,687 acres. Located in our upper peninsula is one of the largest iron-ore producing regions in the world. From these natural ingredients of natural and manufactured wealth there is found in our State practically every known craft, art, or vocation that our civilization has uncovered. The opportunities for making a living are many in the State of Michigan.

HERITAGE

Appropriately one day, Friday, May 20, has been set aside to memorialize the heritage of Michigan. It will appraise the traditions, culture, and resources that stand today as the "mainsprings" of this and future generations of our State.

NEW FRONTIERS

The last day, Saturday, May 21, properly looks to the future. On this day, New Frontiers Day, the people of Michigan will take a vigorous look to the future with the sober realization that our State must secure for itself and all America the fruits of a truly revolutionary era. Three great human advancements will be centered about the State of Michigan: the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, which will open the heart of America to the seaports of the world; the advent of automation, which will radically effect the now major element of manufacture, labor; and the first commercial use, for peaceful purposes, of atomic energy. The responsible use of these three great additions to our technical genius will require the leaders of our state to weigh judiciously, in the scales of human justice, the inherent rights of labor along side the revolutionary methods of manufacture. To achieve one, at the expense of the other, will reward us with chaos. I have faith that the wisdom that these leaders have demonstrated in the past will be reflected in their policies of the future.

I'M GLAD I LIVE IN MICHIGAN

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will not judge Michiganders as conceited when they hear repeated the theme of Michigan week 1955 "I'm glad I live in Michigan." This expression is not to be interpreted with a silent "rather than."

It is really a demonstration of appreciation by all Michiganders for the multitude of opportunities that exist in our State for serving all America. It is joyous gratitude for our God-given special endowments, and through their display it is a sharing of those gifts with the rest of the world. It is this spirit of sharing that we extend to you, our sister States, during Michigan week.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks made in Committee of the Whole in connection with the consideration of the bill H. R. 2126 just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONFUSION ABOUT SALK VACCINE

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVIDSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, it is now over a month since we learned that the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis was proved successful and effective. We were told then, that the mass inoculation of all our children could begin immediately. Our joy and our gratefulness knew no bounds.

However, the elation we all knew on April 12, 1955, when with unstinting fanfare the success of Dr. Salk was announced, has been reduced in a few short weeks to bewilderment, worry, and new fear, bringing the entire situation to the border of pandemonium. The most horrifying aspect being the fact that the ugly morning after is not wearing off. It lingers and seems to get worse. The confusion engendered by the niggardly attitude and pronouncements of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is indeed a sorry sight. From April 12 on to today, no plan, no program, in fact, no suggestion or guidance has been forthcoming from the Department of the United States Government charged with responsibility over our health and welfare. Were it not for the fact that lives are at stake, time could be relied upon to correct Mrs. Hobby's folly. Children's lives are being endangered if not lost by each minute of delay.

Several bills designed to give President Eisenhower standby power to put Federal control into effect over the price and distribution of Salk vaccine have been introduced. The first of these was proposed on April 18. The chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. SPENCE] has scheduled and held hearings on these measures, which would put the ultimate decision to invoke control in the hands of the President. The Surgeon General has appeared before that committee, suspended and now par-

tially restored Federal approval of the vaccine. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, was scheduled to appear before our committee last week. She begged to be excused and despite repeated invitations to testify at a time convenient to her has remained unavailable to the House of Representatives while her subordinate, the Surgeon General, states he cannot speak for the Department.

Certainly, no one would suggest that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is not concerned and worried and working. They appear to be breaking all records for holding intra-office, closed conferences. These proceed night and day. The result of each, as the New York Herald-Tribune has so ably pointed out, is a marked lack of clarity. Nothing has been put forward up to this time by the Office of Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby which brings light to the situation or brings order to the confusion created by this apparent abnegation of her duty. There has been far too much lack of clarity in what was from the outset an emergency situation of national proportions.

On April 13, 1955, it was reported that Mrs. Hobby called off a full-dress, ceremonial press conference scheduled for 4 p. m. because the Public Health Service had not yet submitted its final judgment on the vaccine evaluation study made by Dr. Francis. At 5:15 p. m. that day Mrs. Hobby signed the documents licensing but six pharmaceutical firms to manufacture the vaccine. Every public statement issued by Mrs. Hobby indicates that her Department did not know until April 12 that the report on the Salk vaccine would be favorable; that it made no preparations whatsoever based on the eventuality that the report might be favorable, and that it did not begin to study the Francis report until that same day. This fantastic failure would be ludicrous if it were not so patently tragic.

The Public Health Service entered the picture as early as late in 1953, when it was invited to participate by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. On May 13, 1954, Dr. W. G. Workman, of the National Institutes of Health Laboratory of Biologics Control of the Public Health Service, attended a conference where he helped Dr. Salk and members of the staff of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis explain the step-by-step process of both producing and testing the Salk vaccine to representatives of 11 drug companies.

Two of the firms represented at the 1954 meeting, which were licensed on April 12 of this year to manufacture the Salk vaccine, have their stock listed on the New York Stock Exchange. On March 1, 1955, the price of these 2 stocks was 23¼ and 37½, respectively. By April 11, before the results of the Francis report were made public, these 2 stocks were selling for 29¼ and 49½. Perhaps it is mere coincidence, but these two prices are about the highs for both firms this year.

I am proud to say that Dr. Leona Baumgartner, commissioner of the health department in my own New York

City, was preparing last fall for what Dorothy Kahn in the April 19 issue of the Reporter magazine calls one of the greatest opportunities in preventive medicine in our time. On October 24, 1954, Dr. Baumgartner told the New York Times that her office was making plans to protect as many children as possible if the vaccine should prove effective.

But the Public Health Service of the United States says it knew nothing until April 12. Since then, however, the Surgeon General and Secretary Hobby have conferred and conferred and conferred. The only tangible result of their deliberations thus far has been the entire suspension of the inoculation program, now partially restored, and the repeated statement that no need exists for Federal control or standby authority over the distribution of the vaccine.

Walter Lippmann, in a brilliant article published May 10 in the New York Herald Tribune, lucidly set the record straight. He wrote:

The fact of the matter is that on April 12, the responsible authorities went off half-cocked. * * * The inaction of the Federal Government was due in some considerable degree to theoretical misconceptions, to unexamined and false notions of the general principles of free enterprise, voluntary co-operation, and decentralization—and to the strange prejudice that the only way the Federal Government can assume direction and control of anything is to build up a vast bureaucracy.

Certainly it is a good thing to have differing schools of thought on the question of Federal control. Honest differences of opinion and their open discussion have built this great country. Mrs. Hobby could have helped that process by coming before a committee of the House and making an attempt to clarify the issues, inform the public, and candidly express her views as to granting President Eisenhower the power to decide whether we should have control or not.

I think we must have control now. Too much time has already elapsed. My bill would give the President power to use control or to use voluntary agreements. We can give the President the authority to take action quickly and effectively. Further delay could be disastrous. I am confident that the House will take the appropriate and necessary action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the bill S. 1006, and include a report of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit this afternoon in executive session during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, while the House was in Committee of the Whole, I asked and received unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the Record.

I now ask unanimous consent to include therewith a statement made before the Senate Interior Committee in connection with this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SURPLUS FOOD PROGRAM IN ILLINOIS

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it came to my attention recently that the Illinois Public Aid Commission, the State agency who had been handling the distribution of surplus food commodities in my district and other Illinois critical labor areas, had indicated its desire to discontinue this food distribution program to needy people. Even though no indication was given by the commission as to why it desired to discontinue this program, it is entirely possible that it was discouraged by the present investigation now being conducted by the House subcommittee of the Illinois school lunch program.

Having been advised by the United States Department of Agriculture that it had adequate surplus commodities available and ready for shipment into this depressed area, but that the Department of Agriculture could not ship such surplus commodities without a request from the proper State agency, I sent the following telegram to Governor Stratton on May 4 urging immediate action by him so that this program would not be discontinued:

MAY 4, 1955.

GOV. WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Springfield, Ill.:

Investigation by me as to the probable discontinuance of distribution of surplus food commodities in my district and other Illinois critical labor areas reveals Federal Government has adequate surplus commodities available and ready for shipment into this stricken area. Am further advised by the Director of the food-distribution program, United States Department of Agriculture, that the Illinois Public Aid Commission has indicated its desire to discontinue this distribution. The United States Department of Agriculture cannot ship such food commodities to Illinois without request from the proper State agency. Inasmuch as group IV, critical labor areas, are in dire need of continuance of this assistance program, urgently request that you take immediate action to designate appropriate State agency to continue the administration of this surplus commodity program in Illinois. Please wire collect advising action taken by you.

PETER J. MACK, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Although I have not, as yet, received an answer to my telegram to the Governor, and regardless of the reason the Illinois Public Aid Commission desired to discontinue the handling of these much needed surplus food commodities in these critical labor areas, I am pleased to inform the House today that the commission has advised me of its willingness to continue this program, and has also advised that 2 days after my telegram to the Governor the commission "notified all counties in group IV, critical areas of Illinois, that surplus food commodities would be continued." It is most gratifying to know that this action has been taken by the State agency following my telegram to Governor Stratton, inasmuch as these people in this depressed area are badly in need of this Federal assistance.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLFELD asked and was given permission to address the House on Thursday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

THE UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE SHOULD BE REVIEWED IMMEDIATELY BY CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, ever since Congress enacted the Uniform Code of Military Justice, each year as I take my active duty for training as a Naval Reserve captain, I am confronted with criticism of the code from officers of all branches of the armed services with whom I come in contact.

As yet I have not found a single officer who favors the code in its present form.

In fact, many officers urged me as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to interest my colleagues in Congress in seeking a careful review of the code to the end that it may be substantially revised.

Mr. Speaker, the Uniform Code of Military Justice made little change in the substance of the criminal law which governed the armed services prior to and during World War II, but it did make tremendous procedural changes in that law.

It is in the field of procedure that changes are now required.

Present procedure imposes a great burden upon the United States, a burden which results in no compensating benefit to anyone.

This burden is a costly one.

It is estimated that the annual cost of administering the Uniform Code of Military Justice in the armed services is at least \$158 million.

This estimate includes only those items of cost which are susceptible to exact computation, namely, the costs of trial, the costs of operating places of confinement, and the wages paid persons in confinement.

This sum, \$158 million, would provide pay and allowances for 90,000 enlisted

men of the lowest pay grade for a year; it would pay for all the gas and oil used by all Navy and Marine Corps aircraft for 1 year; it would purchase 930 training aircraft.

The burden imposed by the code is costly, too, in that it has increased the time spent by personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps in confinement.

Before the code came into effect the Navy and Marine Corps confined an average of 3.5 persons per thousand.

Now the Navy and Marine Corps confine an average of 8 persons per thousand.

The incidence of confinement has more than doubled.

The burdens which the code places upon the United States are such as no civilian criminal jurisdiction could tolerate for any appreciable length of time.

For example, no civilian jurisdiction could operate its criminal code for long without recourse to bail.

There is no equivalent for bail in the criminal code of the armed services.

Military offenders must be confined if they are escape risks.

Most are escape risks because 80 percent of them are guilty of some type of absenteeism.

Ordinarily civilian criminal codes do not require mandatory reviews of the record before the sentence can be executed.

After conviction by a criminal court a civilian offender may begin to serve his sentence.

This is not true in the military practice.

Before the sentence may be executed there are certain reviews that must be accomplished.

The record must be reviewed by the officer who convened the court; in most cases there must be a review by a supervisory authority as well; and in cases approaching any degree of severity of sentence there must be a review by a board of review in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the service concerned.

Superimposed upon all of these mandatory reviews there is a 30-day appeal period during which an accused person may file a petition for a review by the United States Court of Military Appeals.

This period must be allowed to elapse in appropriate cases before the sentence may be executed.

During the time consumed in making mandatory reviews of the record and during the mandatory appeal period the United States must keep its military prisoners confined.

There is no bail.

However, the sentence of confinement, if any, against an accused person begins to run from the date he is sentenced by the court.

This, of course, is fair and should remain in effect.

Ordinarily in a civilian criminal practice, it will cost an accused person something if he wishes to appeal.

There are likely to be costs of court for him to pay, and he will in most instances be faced with the necessity of employing a lawyer.

These costs will not be encountered by a military offender.

There are never any circumstances under which any court costs are paid by an accused; and, unless he wishes to employ civilian counsel, the Government will furnish him counsel free, not only for his trial but for the entire appellate procedure as well.

Financially speaking, therefore, there is no impediment upon an accused person appealing his case all the way, even if he entered a plea of guilty at his trial.

Perhaps the most significant and important procedural defect in the uniform code of military justice lies in the fact that the appellate bodies provided by the code are in no way protected from frivolous appeals.

It has been pointed out that there is no fiscal impediment to appeal.

There is no essential impediment, either.

There need be no real cause for appeal.

A petition to the Court of Military Appeals will come about upon the simple announcement by an accused that he wishes to appeal.

He need specify no reason; in fact, he need not have a reason.

The procedural difficulties previously discussed, namely, no bail; multiple mandatory reviews of the record of trial; a mandatory appeal period; no costs to an accused person; and the fact that appellate bodies are not protected from frivolous appeals; combine to place a burden upon the United States which is unreasonable and harsh and does no one, not even the accused, any good.

It is a common problem with the services to find an accused who wishes to have his sentence finally executed but who cannot be accommodated, although the Government is willing, because of the procedural requirements which must first be satisfied.

The cost, the wasted time are serious burdens imposed by the new code.

However, a more lamentable result of the code has been that although it was designed to make things easier or fairer for accused persons, its net effect has been to make Federal criminal offenders of many young men who, but for the code, would have had their cases disposed of by a commanding officer and would thus have avoided a record of conviction by court-martial.

The Uniform Code of Military Justice is said to apply adversary proceedings to the trials of persons for crimes in the armed services.

It surely does this.

Its adversary proceedings have replaced for the Navy and Marine Corps the procedures under the Articles for the Government of the Navy which are often described as paternal procedures.

A paternal procedure for administering discipline is not a bad system.

In replacing the Navy's and the Marine Corps' paternal systems with the adversary system of the uniform code, the powers of commanding officers to dispose of cases of infraction of discipline without reference to a court were greatly reduced.

This has inevitably resulted in more punishment by court-martial in cases which in the past would have been handled by the commanding officer himself.

The men have suffered.

More of them go before courts and become convicted of Federal offenses.

The code is an important Federal criminal statute.

Men convicted under it enter the category of those convicted of violations of such Federal statutes as the Lindbergh Act, the Dyer Act, the Mann Act, and others.

Actually most military offenders are mere juvenile delinquents, mere wayward boys guilty in 80 percent of the cases of some form of absenteeism which in civilian practice is not a crime at all; and yet the delinquent boy achieves the role of one convicted of a Federal offense.

His commanding officer has no alternative unless he will excuse the offense or inflict completely inadequate punishment, either of which will ruin the discipline of his command.

For the reasons I have cited, the Uniform Code of Military Justice should receive careful scrutiny during the present session of Congress with a view to substantial change.

The feeling in this regard is greatly strengthened by an opinion that the code's cumbersome procedures, burdensome and time consuming as they are, could not stand the test of mobilization.

The strain of mobilization would result in a breakdown of the code's processes and leave the services with no formal machinery for the maintenance of discipline and good order among its members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SILER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLIVER and include an article on Iowa manufactures.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE.

Mr. FJARE.

Mr. ROONEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. BOYLE in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. FEIGHAN.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ENGLE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SISK regarding the farm program.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTIONS, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speak-

er's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 430. An act for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 715. An act for the relief of Toy Lin Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 892. An act for the relief of Jose Perez Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1035. An act for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Irfan Kavar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Rosita A Jecson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1521. An act for the relief of Garabed Papazian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1581. An act for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1645. An act to provide for extension of mortgage purchase contracts of the Federal National Mortgage Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1654. An act for the relief of Eliseu Joaquim Bos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of certain hearings and reports on juvenile delinquency for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution withdrawing suspension of deportation of Bernardino Canares Scalo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLERSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 872. An act for the relief of Mrs. Concetta Saccatti Salliani;

H. R. 876. An act for the relief of Alberto Dal Bello and Mrs. Dina Bristol Dal Bello;

H. R. 881. An act for the relief of Gariella Sardo;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mounira E. Medlej;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elsa Danes;

H. R. 890. An act for the relief of Eliseo Felix Hernandez;

H. R. 911. An act for the relief of Gloria Minoza Medellin;

H. R. 921. An act for the relief of Chia-Tseng Chen;

H. R. 923. An act for the relief of Dr. Danuta Oktawiec;

H. R. 924. An act for the relief of Joseph Marrall;

H. R. 958. An act for the relief of Howard Carl Kaiser;

H. R. 971. An act for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou;

H. R. 976. An act for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Mihalka;

H. R. 984. An act for the relief of Dr. Lycourgos E. Papadakis;

H. R. 1008. An act for the relief of Alexander Turchaninova;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of William Light;

H. R. 1020. An act for the relief of Boris Ivanovitch Oblesow;

H. R. 1048. An act for the relief of Christine Susan Calado;

H. R. 1130. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anita Scavone;

H. R. 1166. An act for the relief of Florence Meister;

H. R. 1177. An act for the relief of Zbigniew Wolynski;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Angelita Haberer;

H. R. 1196. An act for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa;

H. R. 1203. An act for the relief of Ivan Bruno Lomm, also known as Ivan B. Johnson;

H. R. 1220. An act for the relief of Kleoniki Argendeli;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko;

H. R. 1351. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler);

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Stylianos Haralambidis;

H. R. 1501. An act for the relief of Andrea Hernandez Montes Rocha;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Elisabeth Thalhammer and her child, Harold William Bushman III;

H. R. 1511. An act for the relief of Robert George Buldeath and Lenora Patricia Buldeath;

H. R. 1638. An act for the relief of Janis Arvids Reinfelds;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Regina Berg Vomberg and her children, Wilma and Helga Vomberg;

H. R. 1665. An act for the relief of David Manuel Porter;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Marek S. Korowicz;

H. R. 1885. An act for the relief of Orlando Lucarini;

H. R. 1957. An act for the relief of Namiko Nitoh and her child, George F. X. Nitoh;

H. R. 2087. An act for the relief of Erika Rambausk;

H. R. 2261. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Carollo;

H. R. 2276. An act for the relief of Vida Kosnik;

H. R. 2279. An act for the relief of Sister Mary Berarda;

H. R. 2289. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Filgor (nee Sproul);

H. R. 2346. An act for the relief of John P. Farrar;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Theodora Sammartino;

H. R. 2354. An act for the relief of Basil Theodossiou;

H. R. 2361. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Ann Giampietro;

H. R. 2762. An act for the relief of Bent Petersen;

H. R. 2731. An act for the relief of Sing Fong York;

H. R. 2764. An act for the relief of Victor and Irene-Wanda Goldstein;

H. R. 2941. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Majka Grifasi;

H. R. 2954. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene Emma Anderson; and

H. R. 4043. An act for the relief of Rene Rachel Luyse Kubicek.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 17, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

795. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

796. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government for the year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841), the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67) (H. Doc. No. 160); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

797. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending March 31, 1955, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

798. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of contributions for the quarter ending March 31, 1955, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

799. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 7 of 'An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1902, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

800. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide full and fair disclosure of the character of charitable, benevolent, patriotic, or other solicitations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

801. A letter from the executive secretary, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit of the American Society of International Law by a certified public accountant for the year ended December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 9 of the act of September 20, 1950 (64 Stat. 869); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

802. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, entitled 'Crimes and Criminal Procedure,' of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

803.—A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report pertaining to war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public for the period as of March 31, 1955, pursuant to Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

804. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1956 in the amount of \$3,700,000 for the Department of the Interior, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

805. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on business enterprises, pursuant to section 1 (5) of Public Law 108, 83d Congress (H. Doc.

No. 162); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

806. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide grants to assist States in assuring that no child is deprived of an opportunity for immunization against poliomyelitis because of inability to pay the costs of vaccination, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1955, the following bill was reported on May 13, 1955:

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6239. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 16, 1955]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H. R. 5239. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 590). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Reorganization Act of 1946 regarding an investigation of the development of the common system of air navigation and traffic control (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4853. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1955, the following bill was introduced on May 13, 1955:

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 6239. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred May 16, 1955]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 6240. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the cen-

tennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6241. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Alaska so as to provide for a 30-day session of the legislature in each even-numbered year; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6242. A bill to grant school lands in Alaska to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 6243. A bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6244. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of April 25, 1940 (54 Stat. 164), relating to the lights required to be carried by motorboats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6245. A bill to authorize the Panama Canal Company to convey to the Department of State an improved site in Colón, Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 6246. A bill to amend section 4153 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize more liberal propelling power allowances in computing the net tonnages of certain vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6247. A bill to amend subdivision (a) of section 66—unclaimed moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision (b) of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6248. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6249. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to duties of judges of the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6250. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6251. A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 14—discharges, when granted—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended, and subdivision (b) of section 58—notice—of the Bankruptcy Act as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6252. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6253. A bill to provide for an annual audit of the accounts of the White County Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6254. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 6255. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to increase the annuities of present and future annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 6256. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 6257. A bill to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6258. A bill to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6259. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6260. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 6261. A bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6262. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 6263. A bill to amend section 1233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 117 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 6265. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 6266. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 6267. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 6268. A bill to facilitate the construction of drainage works and other minor items on Federal reclamation and like projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 6269. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 6270. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 6271. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 6272. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to provide a preference for elderly couples in determining eligibility for admission to low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 6273. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. R. 6274. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H. R. 6275. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 to provide that gifts to certain religious, charitable, and other organizations shall not be deemed nondeductible because of activities carried on outside the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6276. A bill authorizing the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6277. A bill to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6278. A bill to authorize the conveyance for public purposes of certain lands in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. Res. 244. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. Res. 245. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish to the House of Representatives certain information with respect to Antarctica; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power

Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JUDD: Memorial of the legislature of Minnesota requesting issuance of coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to flood control in San Bernardino County, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the protection of the public health and safety from the hazards of peacetime use of ionizing radiation and byproduct material; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to include coffee under the parity payment program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide continued reimbursement to the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment of Hansen's disease patients in Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a tariff on fresh, frozen, and unprocessed fish, and to devote the proceeds to research; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of Mrs. Ryo Yokoyama and the next of kin of Kaichi Okada and Mataichi Ogawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the Presi-

dent and the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the relief of the next of kin of Kiichi Kida and Kiho Uye-hara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 6279. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertha K. Martensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6280. A bill for the relief of Ernest Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6281. A bill for the relief of Capt. William S. Ahalt, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6282. A bill for the relief of Nathan L. Garner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 6283. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 6284. A bill for the relief of Emilio Poglianich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6285. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Andrej (Avram) Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

263. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of 66 railroad employees of Sioux City, Iowa, members of the Railroad Employees Clubs of America, Inc., urging enactment of legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Act with respect to retirement age and years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

264. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of citizens of Ilion, N. Y., favoring H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

265. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Holy Name Society, St. Jerome's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing support of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Administration's Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks both William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff have made important proposals for winning the cold war, and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader of the Senate, has called for the greatest political offensive in history to

win the cold war. General Sarnoff, in a memorandum presented to the President on April 5 urged that an amount equivalent to 5 or 7½ percent of military defense appropriations be granted to a strategy board for political defense. This, of course, without reducing the military budget and not counting foreign military aid and point 4 types of expenditure. General Sarnoff said:

I am convinced that if the American people and their Congress are made fully aware of the menace we face, of the urgent need for meeting it, and the possibility of doing so by means short of war, they will respond willingly as they have always done in times of national crisis. They will realize that no investment to win the cold war is exorbitant when measured against the stakes involved, and against the costs of the bombing war we seek to head off.

I have introduced several bills in this Congress which are designed to enhance the cultural and artistic prestige of our country for I am convinced that this is as important as any of the "guns and butter" programs which we support. One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for, and are officially indifferent to, our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contributions which we have to give the

peoples of the world. We have only ourselves to blame, for they take their cue from our own Federal Government. In this situation the Communist Parties in the various countries and the U. S. S. R. find it extremely easy to spread their lies that we are gum-chewing, insensitive, materialistic barbarians.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 19, 1955, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has this to say:

Mr. President, I have been pleased to note the increasing evidences of America's counteroffensive against the worldwide Soviet cultural propaganda effort. That Soviet effort is two-pronged. It is (a) designed to defame American culture as allegedly "crass" and "materialistic"; and (b) it is designed to paint a rosy picture of what is actually the barren and enslaved so-called culture of the U. S. S. R.

I am glad to say that an invaluable instrument in our own accurate worldwide cultural effort is the American National Theater and Academy, which was wisely chartered by the Congress under a bill signed by the President of the United States as far back as July 5, 1935.

General Sarnoff states that:

Before essaying a breakdown of cold-war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now underway needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking. The expanded offensive with nonmilitary weapons must be imbued with a new awareness of the great goal and a robust will to reach it.

As early as 1948 John Foster Dulles wrote that:

We need an organization to contest the Communist Party at the level where it is working and winning its victories. * * * We ought to have an organization dedicated to the task of nonmilitary defense, just as the present Secretary of Defense heads up the organization of military defense. The new department of nonmilitary defense should have an adequate personnel and ample funds.

Perhaps the most important of the bills I have introduced in the present Congress is H. R. 5040 which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. A subcommittee has just been established to consider the administration's bill to establish a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the other bills before the committee which provide for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism. The chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. With the growing recognition of the importance of these proposals and the challenging plans of Mr. Hearst and Mr. Sarnoff before us it is high time that hearings were held and that meritorious legislation be reported to the floor for consideration by this Congress.

I include here editorials from the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, and the Washington Post and Times Herald

which discuss the administration's proposals and the other bills before this Congress. Also included is an article from the Chicago American, by David Sentner, chief of the Washington bureau of the Hearst newspapers.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 15, 1955]

OUR CONGRESS COPES WITH CULTURE (By Jay S. Harrison)

The traditional lethargy that inevitably smothered the question of governmental assistance to American artists and art has recently been dealt a decisive jolt. Though they have achieved no especial notoriety, several bills, motions, and suggestions have in the last month been discussed in Washington that point to a renewed interest on the part of our lawmakers in the forces and functions of culture. In fact, they are so many and their stipulations so elaborate that only a few, at best, can be summarized here.

On April 20 Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New York, introduced a bill, thereafter referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which was designed to "provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes." In part, it stated:

"(A) That the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative."

VITAL TO GENERAL WELFARE

"(B) That the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, is essential to the general welfare and the national interest; and

"(C) That the encouragement of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government."

Having thus lucidly established its premise, the measure declares in the second section:

"There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. * * * The Commission shall be composed of 21 members, appointed by the President, from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one of more of the arts."

STUDIES OUTLINED

And as to the bill's meaning, the following explanation is made in section 3:

"The Commission shall undertake studies of, and make recommendations to, appropriate methods * * * for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies shall be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the field of art involved, appointed by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission."

The remainder of H. R. 5756, for so the bill is numbered, devotes itself to the implementation necessary to setting the Federal Advisory Committee on the Arts on a footing sound and firm.

The administration's bill, H. R. 5756, was further accompanied by an excerpt from the President's state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955:

"In the advancement of the various activities which would make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts with the Department of

Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

These sentiments alone, formulated by an eminence in our political hierarchy, indicate that the Government has seriously begun to concern itself with an enterprise previously left pretty much to its own tottering devices. And as if this healthy sign were not enough, the current issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, published May 9, contains a lively debate on the construction, in Washington, of a civic auditorium "including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center." Holding to the view that such a hall is necessary to insure that the District of Columbia become an authentic cultural capital, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey—who, incidentally, has introduced several excellent bills similar to Representative WAINWRIGHT'S—has this to say:

"One of the major ways in which we might turn reluctant and uneasy allies and the millions of uncommitted peoples into friends is to earn their respect for our own culture. It is obvious, however, that if we have no respect for, and are officially indifferent to, our own best cultural efforts, if we show no concern as a people and as a Nation with our own contemporary culture and our living artists, then the peoples of other countries are hardly to be blamed if they ignore and are indifferent to the cultural contributions which we have to give the peoples of the world."

"The fine arts are a unifying force, as Washington and Jefferson knew, and they are especially important to us now when our country is assailed from within and from without by divisive and undemocratic forces from the right and from the left."

These, clearly, are the words of an enlightened man. They reflect a judgment that knows art, understands what its powers are, and Representative THOMPSON'S is no voice crying in the wilderness. Given time, one suspects he will be joined by a hale chorus of supporters sharing his goals and supplementing his ideals.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 16, 1955]

FOR AN ARTS COMMISSION

The hope of a civic auditorium and fine-arts center for Washington was pushed a tiny step forward last week with House passage of a bill creating a Commission to form plans for such a project. Planning is an indispensable preliminary. But the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts urged by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last January is still a radiant but remote vision. Representative STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, a Republican, has introduced a bill drafted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which embodies the President's ideas in this connection. Its merit is attested by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, a Democrat, who some time ago made a rather more comprehensive proposal for an arts commission plus an auditorium and art center for the Nation's Capital.

The President was right when he said in his state of the Union message that "in the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities." We believe that governmental encouragement and stimulation—something altogether different from the regimentation and control characteristics of totalitarian states—can give great impetus to the arts. And we heartily agree with Secretary Hobby's observation that "encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a

nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny."

No better beginning could be made by a Federal Acts Commission than the creation of an auditorium and art center in Washington. This is why we prefer Mr. THOMPSON's bill to Mr. WAINWRIGHT'S. The need for such a center was underscored this week by the Metropolitan Opera Co.'s recourse to a motion-picture theater for temporary accommodation here. The opera, and other forms of art, need a home of their own in Washington.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of May 11, 1955]

AUDITORIUM STUDY

Washington's lack of a civic auditorium adequate to the needs of a city of this size and importance long has been of concern to public and private interests. Demands for a hall large enough to accommodate unusual national or local events, such as inaugural balls, operas, expositions, and the like, have been recurrent over recent years. There never has been a special study of the various problems involved in a major project of this kind, however. Therefore, the House has taken a step in the right direction in voting to create a 21-member commission to consider the auditorium problem.

The move is timely because of the possibility of fitting the project into the broad program for redevelopment of Southwest Washington. The Zeckendorf plan envisions a large meeting hall and cultural center in the heart of the rebuilt community along the water front. Sites in other parts of Washington have been suggested from time to time, including one near the East Capitol Street Bridge. More vexing than the site question is the problem of financing so huge an undertaking. Always in the past any proposal for Federal or District financing has withered under the drought of funds for nonessential improvements.

Lately, however, there has been talk of interesting private investors in a community auditorium enterprise. There have been reports that outside promoters have made inquiries into the availability of suitable sites and into economic aspects of such a plan. The proposed commission can help to clear up the confusion over location, sponsorship, financing, and uses of a great hall for public and commercial gatherings in the Nation's Capital. Until some authoritative information on the project is prepared, the auditorium idea is not likely to make much headway.

[From the Chicago American of April 29, 1955]

HOUSE GROUP OKS PLAN FOR CULTURE HALL (By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey, urges congressional action to promote American culture and sports.

The action would be in line with the program for competitive coexistence with Red Russia advocated by W. R. Hearst, Jr.

The House District Committee favorably reported out THOMPSON'S first bill on the subject. It provides for creation of a Federal commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium. The latter would include an inaugural hall of presidents and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center.

WARNINGS CITED

THOMPSON asked the House to heed warnings by the editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers and by Olympics Committee President Avery Brundage that this country is in danger of losing supremacy at the international games.

THOMPSON said his legislation is designed to put into effect the proposals made by

Hearst upon his return from behind the Iron Curtain, where he interviewed the four top Russian leaders.

The proposal would create a National Advisory Committee under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a program with the States that would make the public more sports and culture conscious.

Six million dollars in Federal funds would be used to match money raised by the States to promote the work.

Welfare Secretary Hobby has approved a bill, introduced by Representative WAINWRIGHT, Republican, of New Jersey, for establishment of a Federal commission on the arts and for other purposes.

However, Representative THOMPSON and his Democratic colleagues do not think this administration bill goes far enough in activating a dynamic competitive coexistence blueprint.

RUSSIAN LEAD

Brundage said the Russians are almost certain to dominate the 1956 Olympic games unless there is a sudden reawakening in this country.

THOMPSON declared:

"The huge Russian sports program is based on a broad and comprehensive system of physical training for everyone in the U. S. S. R. regardless of age or sex.

"Undoubtedly one of the results of this system, started more than 20 years ago, was a substantial contribution to the success of the Soviet armies during World War II. No country is stronger than its people.

"In his speech at Washington's National Press Club, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed.

"America, he said, has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people.

"Mr. Hearst asked: 'How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?'

"Mr. Hearst advocates the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists."

THOMPSON added that the legislation introduced by himself, Representative ROOSEVELT, of California, and Representative REUSS, of Wisconsin, is designed to carry out the excellent proposals and timely warnings of Mr. Hearst.

Progress Report on Desalting Sea Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, in the last decade the diminishing water supply in this country has become a matter of great concern. To realize there is good cause for this concern one only needs to examine past history where whole civilizations have vanished from certain areas of the earth because their water supplies were exhausted.

As the water needs of our country grow, as agriculture and industry require more and more water and our available supplies dwindle, the importance of water to our well-being and to our over-

all national economy is impressed upon us more and more. Expansion of our industries, our growing populations, and expanding agricultural production have increased tremendously the demand for large quantities of fresh water. This continued growth and expansion has placed a severe drain on water resources in certain areas. The sources of water on which we normally rely are gradually being exhausted and, through use and reuse, the supplies derived from these sources are being contaminated. There is an urgent need then for finding additional fresh-water sources.

Last year thousands of cities and towns throughout the Nation were forced to adopt measures curtailing water use. The availability of water has become a major factor in the location of industry, as industrial water needs rapidly expand.

In the face of this alarming water situation, there is encouraging news for many of the areas most concerned over their dwindling water supplies. These are the areas that have an unlimited source of water but up to now this water has not been useable because of the salt content. There is enough fresh water in 1 cubic mile of ocean water to supply the entire Nation for 8 days. The problem then is to separate the pure water from the salt and this problem is well on the way to being solved.

On June 2, 1952, this body—House of Representatives—passed legislation establishing a research program with the objective of developing economically feasible processes for converting saline or salt water to fresh water. This legislation was enacted and became known as the Saline Water Act of 1952. I am happy to report that progress under this research program has been encouraging. No longer does any area have to face the possibility of running out of water as long as there are supplies of salt or saline water available. Economic demineralization of saline water is in sight.

By this program initiated by the Congress in 1952, the foundation is being laid for realistic development of practical conversion processes. At the beginning of the program the cost of converting sea water to fresh water by the best processes in use was estimated at about \$400 to \$500 an acre-foot. The initial cost goals for the program were set at \$125 per acre-foot for municipal water and \$40 per acre-foot for irrigation water on the basis that these amounts represented about the maximum that could be borne by these types of use. These goals are in sight and it is believed that they can be reached and lowered if the research is continued.

In accordance with the Saline Water Act of 1952, the research program is being accomplished under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior through, first, federally financed contracts for conducting scientific research with private scientists and engineers, educational institutions, scientific organizations, and engineering firms; second, encouraging development of saline water conversion processes by correlating and coordinating efforts in this field; and third, stimulating the interest of private and public organizations and individuals in the

program. Some of the outstanding scientists in the country are working on the problem. In addition, there is a group of eminent leaders of educational, scientific, and industrial organizations serving as an advisory board to provide the Secretary with advice on broad policy matters relating to the program. The research and development now in progress is being watched with much interest by those engaged in similar projects in a number of foreign countries and there is cooperation between this Government and those abroad having mutual interest in this problem.

Many ideas and processes have been studied. Some have shown promise and some have been discarded. The processes under study include: First, electric membrane processes; second, vapor compression distillation; third, solar distillation; fourth, critical pressure devices; fifth, osmotic processes; sixth, solvent extraction; and seventh, separation by freezing. The technical details of these processes for those who are interested may be obtained from the printed hearings before the Interior Committee or may be obtained from the Department of the Interior.

The program embodied in the 1952 act was for 5 years and called for the expenditure of \$2 million over the 5-year period. H. R. 2126 would amend the Saline Water Act of 1952 to provide for uninterrupted continuation of the saline water conversion research program. This legislation would modify the basic act by extending the period of the research program by 5 years, by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated from \$2 million to \$6 million, and by permitting research to be carried on to a limited extent in existing Government laboratories.

Under the provisions of the 1952 act, all research activities and field tests, including reports thereon and the correlation and coordination of all data, must be completed prior to July 15, 1957. It is necessary that extension of the program be authorized at this time if it is to continue without interruption. Under the existing law, most active research contracting would have to be terminated by about December of this year to permit completion of the work under the contract and final reporting of the results and conclusions by the deadline of July 1957.

Unless the program is extended, it would be terminated just at a time when the need for advance research and development of the most promising processes is expected to be paramount. Up until now, most of the research and development on processes has been on a relatively small-scale laboratory basis. Much of this exploratory research needs to be continued; however, in addition a few processes have shown sufficient promise to warrant the installation of pilot plants or the undertaking of field tests. Such plants and tests are essential in order to obtain reliable cost estimates and information on the durability of the unit, production capacity, power requirements and other data necessary to demonstrate the feasibility of large-scale conversion.

The need for authority to use Government laboratories to a limited extent is primarily for the purpose of making unbiased comparisons of processes in confirmation of research results.

With the encouraging results from recent advancements, primarily as a result of the legislation passed in 1952, I do not hesitate to predict that this research program, if it is continued, will result in development of processes which will, within the extension requested by this legislation, produce fresh water for municipal use in certain areas at a cost that is competitive with other sources and will produce fresh water for agricultural purposes in certain areas from brackish water at a cost which will be feasible.

Biscuits and Cornbread for Coal Miners and Other Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 3706, similar to several others of equal intent and purpose, seeking to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to process our surplus grains, now owned by the taxpayers but which are no more useful than a miser's coins under the floor board, in order that those grains may become flour and meal for our unemployed coal miners and for other Americans. Like the hoarding miser, we know the grain is ours somewhere in nice storage piles, but in our inner wisdom from the Lord, we also know that such stored grain will never be useful until placed in channels of human consumption at home or abroad. And I for one believe in being good to our own before we hunt for recipients for our goods in Turkey or Pakistan. I do hope many Members of this body will give much thoughtful consideration to the desirability for this type of legislation during these days of unemployment in our great coal industry. If we encourage Venezuela by permitting that country to ship unlimited quantities of residual oil into America to compete with our domestic coal industry, then we ought to encourage our own unemployed coal miners by enacting legislation authorizing the processing of surplus grains into flour for biscuits and into meal for corn dodgers for the worthy families of some of the best Americans this side of Paradise, the mining people of southeastern Kentucky and of other sections of our coal-mining regions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a poet. But once I was booked for a memorial address at a little mining community down in Whitley County, Ky., in honor of the departed coal miners all of us had known and loved as neighbors and friends before they were called to that mystic bourne from which no traveler has ever returned. So, I came

up with a little poem honoring the miners we proposed to remember on that occasion. It follows below:

THE MINING MAN

(By EUGENE SILER, Williamsburg, Ky.)

(Read at homecoming of Bon Jellico miners on September 17, 1950)

Miner, miner shining bright
Down in caverns of the night.
How could wheels make their turn,
How could bright fires dance and burn
Without you, O mining man?

War or peace must have your coal,
A world is waiting for black gold.
So make a cut and shoot it down,
Load it up to go to town.
Blessing on you, mining man!

Toil and danger both you know,
Sometimes joy and sometimes woe.
But light of night comes by your hand
And with your help we run this land.
Hail to you, O mining man!

So now, Mr. Speaker, I trust this body at the proper time will not merely consider doing the Democratic thing or the Republican thing but rather the Christian thing toward the unemployed "mining man" and others in giving support to the legislation I have mentioned. I have decided that during my own congressional career, whether short or long, I do not intend to be pro-labor nor pro-capital nor pro-conservative nor pro-radical, but I do intend to be very pro-Christian and very pro-American. And I believe this legislation I have mentioned is both Christian and American in its basic character.

Don't Turn Diverted Acres Into Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, our present Federal farm programs have not solved the many problems facing the dairy farmers of the Nation. In fact, some elements of the general farm program not related to dairy farming actually impose new problems for dairy farmers and the dairy industry. I refer specifically to the problem of diverted acres from other types of farming. It appears that in the past the diverted acres have been temporarily turned into use for dairying. This, of course, intensifies the problems of farmers normally and regularly engaged in dairy farming.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 7, 1955, issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer which discusses this problem. Here is the full text of the editorial:

It is true that the milk surplus picture looks a bit brighter than in 1954. However, there is still a big black cloud hanging over the dairy future.

The thought of 30 million diverted acres is a continuing worry to dairymen. These are the acres taken out of corn, wheat, and cotton production by farmers who comply with Federal crop controls.

Government policy is to get these extra acres into hay and pasture crops. This is good for the land but it is sure to mean extra competition and more milk surpluses.

More acres of hay and pasture are sure to mean more meat and milk. The only thing to do with forage is to feed it to cattle and sheep. Some of those added cattle will be dairy cows.

We hate to see these diverted acres shifted from corn, cotton, and wheat and put into milk production. Competition is tough enough as it is.

Acreage taken out of those crops should be taken completely out of circulation. Otherwise they solve one problem only to create another.

I wish to point out to my colleagues that I have introduced a bill, H. R. 5942, which I believe solves the problem of diverted acres. Briefly, my bill calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to annually determine and proclaim prior to November 15 of each year a national conservation acreage reserve for the succeeding year. The Secretary of Agriculture, after surveys, will determine how many acres of land are needed for current production needs and how many acres of land are to be diverted into the conservation reserve.

The national conservation reserve will then be broken down into State allocations. The States in turn will allocate the reserve acreage to counties in the same ratio as the previous year's acreage in national production totals. County farmer committees will then allocate the county's conservation reserve to individual farmers on a similar basis.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into annual agreements with individual farmers for the making of incentive payments to farmers who agree to put the specified number of acres into a conservation reserve on their farms. Such incentive payments will be based on the value of the customary landlord's share, in the area where the farm is located, of commodities which the Secretary determines would be produced on the reserve acres if they were used for commercial production for the crop year on which the contract is made. The bill limits incentive payments to \$2,000 for any farm operator's unit.

I believe if my bill is adopted it will solve the problem of diverted acres—diverted acres that in the past have sometimes been turned into dairying or other types of farming. Under my bill diverted acres will be used for a conservation reserve. It is a reserve plan that will protect our top soil when we need it for an emergency or in the not too distant future to meet increased population of the Nation.

Developing a Sound Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have just had the pleasure of having as my guest

on a radio program for the people of my district, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of this House. I was so struck by his informative discussion of our farm problems that I would like to repeat here some of the ground we covered and plead for quick and vigorous action by this Congress toward developing a sound farm program.

In casting my vote for H. R. 12, which would restore 90-percent parity price supports for basic agricultural commodities and put a floor of 80 percent under dairy supports, I am not under any illusion that this measure is any more than a step in the direction of adequate farm income security. I would like to make it clear that I do not consider price supports, whether fixed at 90 percent or flexible, as anything more than a temporary prop to try to keep a large number of our farmers from going bankrupt and losing their farms during the period before we can work out a sound, permanent, and effective program.

In the first place, I am unhappy because H. R. 12 makes no provision to help agricultural industries outside the so-called basic crops and dairying. I believe that other farmers, raising other crops, are as much entitled to help as are the producers of the basic crops. In my own district we have large production of grapes, raisins, fruits and vegetable crops and the farmers who are supplying these essentials to the Nation have problems equally difficult with those of the producers of cotton, wheat, corn, rice, and peanuts, and I believe their economic welfare is as important to the Nation as is the survival of farmers producing basic commodities.

I think it must be apparent that if price supports are to serve any effective purpose in saving our farm families from going under, they must be at 90 percent of parity. Actually, the difference between the 90 percent and the 75 percent or 80 percent they would receive under the flexible support program is the amount keeping them alive and eating and able to operate their farms. For a large percentage of our farms, it is the slim margin of survival. The Secretary of Agriculture has publicly stated that the policy of the administration is to eliminate 10 percent of farm families. That means about 500,000 families, about 2 million men, women, and children of America who have chosen farming as a way of life. The Secretary of Agriculture also advocates the flexible price support program and it is apparent he and the administration propose to use this device as a means of accomplishing his purpose to drive farmers away from their farms.

Recently President Eisenhower delivered a message to the Congress endorsing a program of farm help put together by Secretary of Agriculture Benson. After wrestling with the problem of what to do with our farmers who are on the verge of going under, what do they come up with? A proposal that the Federal Government assist them by educating them not to be farmers. They propose we solve our farm problem by educating farmers to be laborers or mechanics—not by helping them to be better farm-

ers, or trying to solve their price or distribution problems. This would sound ridiculous if it were not tragic confirmation of the existence of an administration program to liquidate farm families. Actually, it fits into a program which also is designed to pinch off and abandon reclamation, which would put water on millions of acres and in many instances convert them from marginal to fine, producing acres, helping to solve the world's food shortage.

May I recall to you the prediction of former President Truman when he dedicated an important reclamation dam in 1952 and told his listeners to mark it well, for if the Republican Party gained power, they would not see another dam like it? How well he knew the plans of the present administration is shown by the fact that there has not been a single new reclamation start since January 1953.

All this fumbling with our farms adds up to an administration philosophy I think is unknown to many of our farmers. It amounts to a plan to drive farmers out of business and herd them into industrial pursuits. As tools to accomplish this purpose we have flexible, bankruptcy price supports, stopping reclamation programs which would create new irrigated farms, and proposals to recruit farmers into industrial plants. Instead of a program to keep farmers in business producing food and fiber, we are asked to go along with a program to drive them off the farms. This is the opposite of a farm program as I see it.

Since I have been in Washington I have been astonished and aghast at the hopeless, helpless attitude of the Department of Agriculture. I wish our farmers generally could see the callous and cold reaction of the leaders in that Department to the human problems they should be trying to solve. Believe me, when I take up with officials of the Department of Agriculture the acute and immediate problems of a major segment of agriculture, the turkey industry, and am informed the Department proposes to do nothing to cooperate with the industry, I cannot accept their plan to shake out less efficient producers—to solve the problems by permitting chaos in the industry this fall, with inevitable bankruptcy for thousands.

The fact of the matter is that a continued program of price supports is necessary at this time primarily because the administration has completely failed to develop a farm program. It appears we cannot expect such a program from the hopeless, helpless group now charged with this responsibility. As I see it, development of a long-range farm program is up to us and we cannot expect cooperation from the administration. When such a program is developed, we no longer will be concerned with either flexible or rigid price supports on their present basis, and I, for one, will be happy to see the end of this artificial emergency aid.

How shall we go about working out a farm program? Certainly, we have a valid objective, and that must be to provide a farm economy in which every hard-working farmer will know that by proper, efficient farm management, he

can recover his costs of production and receive a profit sufficient to raise and educate his children under a standard of living we want in an American home.

Because we have proof with which we cannot argue that the world as a whole has a serious food shortage, we must grant that our local situation, with what appears to be surpluses, can be smoothed out by proper distribution.

Reciprocal trade provides the basic tool for foreign agricultural distribution, and it is too bad the Department of Agriculture continues to drag its feet in developing world markets for our surplus farm production.

We need also to encourage marketing agreements, cooperative marketing associations, advertising and distribution programs to knock off the peak of surplus production and fill in the valleys of underproduction.

We must curb food profiteering and speculation abuses and cut the costs of distribution, so that consumers can get food and clothing at fair prices while farmers receive a fair return. I am most happy to learn from Congressman COOLEY that the Agriculture Committee of this House is embarking on a program to study consumer and farm prices, and I have every hope that legislation to deal with this problem will result.

We need more advance planning of projects to convert marginal land into good farms, through increased soil conservation and a renewed program for reclamation, and we must overcome and throw aside the reluctance of the present administration to go ahead with these vital projects.

In the face of a hopeless, helpless administration, the need of action by this Congress is urgent, lest delays wreck our farm economy and change our most basic strength into an agricultural shambles.

Administration Gives Only Lipservice to Career Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has built a reputation for giving lipservice to many fine principles, and then by its actions completely and callously disregarding these principles.

The list of examples is long. Nowhere is it more in evidence than in connection with the civil service. From the President on down, and from the President's Silver Spring, Md., campaign speech in 1952 we have heard very high-sounding pronouncements, with which we may all agree, about the administration's devotion to strengthening the civil service; and more about eliminating favoritism, political and otherwise, in the selection and promotion of career employees.

Last year it was the infamous Willis directive, issued from the White House,

which gave the career service a body blow. This year it has been the fine print in Executive Order 10577 which has brought so many complaints and charges of favoritism and discrimination in connection with the conversion program to the offset of those Members representing districts where there are a number of Federal employees.

The National Civil Service League, a nonpartisan organization composed of some of the most outstanding people in the country, has proved to be a good watchdog, and constantly calls our attention to abuses by the administration.

Mr. James R. Watson, executive director of the league, discussed some of the more flagrant cases of abuse in a speech he made before the Society for Personnel Administration. In so doing he called the roll of the many instances where practice has differed sharply from the lip service of the administration.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include a news account of Mr. Watson's remarks written by Joseph Young in the Washington Evening Star for May 12, 1955:

POLITICAL FAVORITISM CHARGED IN PROMOTIONS (By Joseph Young)

The executive director of the nonpartisan National Civil Service League charged today that partisan politics and favoritism are influencing the promotion and appointment chances of Government career employees.

James R. Watson, executive director of the league, told the annual meeting of the Society for Personnel Administration:

"This is where the patronage problem is especially serious. * * * It is impossible to sufficiently emphasize the demoralizing effect of such efforts.

"If we are to have a system whereby certain so-called career people must get political indorsements and be subjected to political tests before receiving appointments to career positions, then we will never achieve the advancements in the civil-service system which we need."

The official of the 80-year-old business-supported organization called on the administration to clarify its policy regarding the career service and remove any cause for suspicion of partisan influence which will prevent the constructive programs now under way from realizing their full potential.

AFFECTS SELECTION

"If the career service is to be subjected to political tests, Philip Young and his staff at the Civil Service Commission might as well abandon their progressive efforts to improve executive development and training," Mr. Watson said. The public cannot afford to train executives in the career service who will be subjected to political suspicion by future administrations. Adequate selection of people for training cannot be accomplished where political favoritism is involved.

If there are to be political tests, then President Eisenhower might as well discontinue efforts for the President's incentive award program. What kind of incentive award system can we have if every person receiving an award is going to be suspected of being a political favorite?

Mr. Watson cautioned Government personnel officials not to resist changes in the civil-service system that will make the system more dynamic and workable.

HELD TO NEED IMPROVEMENT

Declaring that civil service "needs improvement," Mr. Watson added: "Just as we guard against favoritism, we must also be careful that we do not view every proposal for change as a raid on the merit system. In other words, civil service must be protect-

ed from the entrenched bureaucrats just as much as it must be protected from the pious politician who is going to save democracy from the civil service."

Mr. Watson observed that political patronage, rather than civil service, was on the defensive these days, because the American public and the Nation's press are strong supporters of the merit system.

PROGRAMS STALLED

At yesterday's afternoon session in the Hotel Statler, CSC Chairman Philip Young told the SPA the current hassle over Federal pay-rise legislation threatens to delay action this year on other administration employee-benefit proposals, such as group health insurance and employee training programs.

Mr. Young also declared that the present system of having Congress adjust classified and postal salaries is too slow and cumbersome. He urged consideration of plans to place all Federal agencies on a full or partial wage-board basis, the same as is the base for per diem workers.

Acknowledging that such plans offer some practical difficulties, Mr. Young said that might be adaptable within a general framework of congressional control.

The CSC Chairman also said that a number of difficulties have to be ironed out before the Government joins in the single-packaged community charity drive. Mr. Young emphasized he is not opposed to a single-packaged drive. He said, however, the problem must be carefully studied and worked out before it is put into operation.

Mr. Young also strongly praised the administration's constructive personnel program for Government employees during the past few years, citing the numerous fringe benefits given to Federal workers.

Milk Prices Will Increase if Surplus Decreases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the May 7, 1955, issue of the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer. The editorial follows:

Should milk supports be boosted back up to 90 percent of parity? No one would blame a Wisconsin farmer for quickly answering "Yes" to that question. However, it is not that simple.

In April 1954 Secretary Benson cut supports from 90 down to 75 percent of parity in a single day. We argued that the drop was too far and too sudden and unfair to dairying compared to other farm products. We still feel that it could have been done differently.

How does the situation look as of May 1955? Is this the time to push for a return to 90-percent supports?

People are definitely using more milk, butter, and cheese than before the price drop. Production has leveled off. So the surplus picture has improved.

Milk checks took quite a beating during the past year. Dairymen realize more than anyone just how much that hurt.

But we must keep two things in mind. First, there is no chance politically of getting 90-percent supports without controls on production. Second, if production isn't controlled, the country might get fed up with

dairy-support programs and we would lose what we have.

Congress will vote 90-percent dairy parity only if the program carries built-in controls on milk output. Do you want to be told how much milk you may produce?

There is a tool which would solve surplus troubles. It is production payments and it should have been given a trial long ago.

Let the market drop to where it will. Then let the Government make direct payments to farmers to make up the difference between market price and support price.

Once that surplus is handled, dairy supports and prices can again work their way higher, where they belong. Not only 90 percent but 100 percent of parity.

The editorial, as you will note, correctly observes that dairy products will never be supported at 90 percent of parity unless there are production controls and marketing quotas applied to the industry in the same manner as basic commodities are supported.

I do not know if the majority of the Nation's dairy farmers are willing to accept controls and marketing quotas. The reason that I do not know is because the Nation's dairy farmers have never been given the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of such a program. It is my hope that the Dairy Subcommittee of the House will hold some hearings this year out in the country to get grassroots thinking of dairy farmers on this and other related problems.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, which will make dairy products a basic commodity and which provides for control and marketing quotas. If the program is approved by Congress, dairy farmers will receive compensation through incentive payments, as suggested in the editorial quoted above.

I believe H. R. 4360 has considerable merit, but before action in Congress on it I would like to have it fully understood by the Nation's dairy farmers. If the majority of dairy farmers do not want such a program—and we don't know at this time what their thinking is on this matter—then the issue would be resolved on this approach. Until such time as we have sufficient opinion from all of the major dairy producing areas we cannot say that dairy farmers favor the program or that they oppose it.

That is why I hope the Dairy Subcommittee will hold the hearings I have suggested to get the broadest possible view of dairy farmers on support programs.

The Conference at the Summit— Its Basic Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 15, the Polish American Congress of 400 organizations of Americans of Polish descent, held appropriate ceremonies in Cleveland commemorating Polish Constitution Day. It was my

privilege to be the speaker on that occasion. My remarks were devoted to an expression of the unbreakable connection between the spirit of human freedom as expressed in the Polish constitution and the current struggle in which are now engaged to save individual liberty and the free institutions as we know them. Our participation in any meeting involving the masters of the Kremlin, whether it takes place at the summit or in a more realistic atmosphere of open covenants, openly arrived at, must be based upon a clear recognition that the cause of freedom is both indivisible and timeless. Since I offered what I consider to be some practical suggestions for the administration in connection with the possibility of such a conference taking place, under unanimous consent, I include my address in the RECORD:

THE CONFERENCE AT THE SUMMIT— ITS BASIC ISSUE

I am honored to be able to join with you today in commemorating Polish Constitution Day. One hundred and sixty-four years ago Poland established a constitution which, in its basic essentials, reflects the great moral and political principles of our own American Declaration of Independence.

This constitution was enacted at a time when Poland was under an alien occupation, by a parliament of true and patriotic Poles, who were determined to create an indelible instrument to stand as a symbol of the great Polish spirit.

The magnitude and enduring quality of that constitution is attested to by the fact that it has endured as an indestructible symbol of the Polish nation.

It would do us well today to examine, for a moment, article 5 of the Polish constitution. Article 5 best expresses the form of government which the framers of this constitution intend for Poland and which, in my opinion, is a true reflection of the Polish spirit throughout all of recorded history.

Article 5 reads as follows:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on lasting foundation."

It is clear that the will of the people was the determining element in all matters requiring parliamentary action or civil authority.

Our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights are, above all other things, founded upon the basic concept that the will of the people is paramount.

We are saddened today as we see the Polish nation suffering under a new occupation—Russian communism, the most cruel, barbarous, inhuman, evil tyranny ever visited upon any people or nation in the long history of mankind. We recall that in the period between the two World Wars, there was a rebirth of Polish independence and an almost unprecedented revival of the rich and generous culture of the Polish.

We also remind ourselves that when the conspiracy of communism was probing into the nations beyond the confines of the prison of nations which we know as the Soviet Union, the Polish nation remained staunch and fearless in its treatment of the threat of communism.

It is an undisputed fact of history that communism was never an internal threat to the security of the Polish nation and that the Polish Government never feared to call the hand of the Russians on any matter affecting the security of Poland.

This is a lesson which we, the people of the leading Nation of the world today, should carefully consider and reflect upon in these trying times.

We also recall that with the rise of Hitler and his anti-Christian theories of nazism, the Polish nation stood firm in the face of this new danger.

When Hitler, encouraged and stimulated in his plan of aggression, by the demonstrated lack of moral courage and principle on the part of western statesmen, made threats against the Polish nation, he learned that the Poles intended to fight for what was right.

The Polish nation was caught in the merciless vise of the dictators, Stalin and Hitler.

It is a fact of history that when most of the larger and more secure nations of Europe were urging that Poland take a conciliatory tone toward Hitler in order to prevent the outbreak of war, the Polish people did not hesitate to stand up for those basic principles upon which the cause of human freedom depends, and without which the tyrant and despot makes easy prey of nations and men.

It was in these circumstances that heroic Poland, standing fast in defense of the cause of justice and freedom, was invaded by the overwhelming power of the dictators, Hitler and Stalin.

It is therefore accurate for us to say that World War II was fought for the cause which Poland so nobly represents even though the Polish people received the most frightful rewards in the postwar period.

The great event in history which we commemorate today would be a very shallow affair if we did not ask ourselves these questions—what are the hopes for Poland in the foreseeable future? What have we done? What can we do to bring the Polish nation back to its well deserved place in the family of free and sovereign nations?

These may not be popular questions and indeed they may be questions which frighten the more timid of men who, in any case, have never been defenders of the cause of individual liberty or the rights of nations.

But these are questions which disturb the conscience of all freemen. Finding the answers to these questions, in my opinion, will likely spell the difference between peace and war.

It is part of our great American heritage that we seek peace and comity among all nations. But it is also part of our heritage that we have the courage to stand up for what is right regardless of what the immediate cost may be to us.

During the last session of Congress, I was a member of a select committee which did attempt to find the answers to these questions and consequently made an exhaustive study of the entire background leading to the loss of individual liberties and national sovereignty by Poland and all the other non-Russian nations now enslaved within the empire of communism.

After completing that study and hearing the testimony of hundreds of eye witnesses, we concluded the following, among other things:

"That the continued occupation of the captive nations by Soviet Communist power is the basic cause of the growing menace of war and stands as a threat to the security of the United States. This threat is increased in direct proportion to the time and opportunity afforded the Communists to digest and consolidate their gains, and to use these gains as bases for further and greater aggressions. This threat is diminished in direct proportion as the Communist hold on the captive nations is weakened by a positive policy that promotes the forces of national independence behind the Iron Curtain."

This committee also recommended that our Government, in the interest of preventing world war III, undertake a political action program against the international Communist conspiracy. It charted a specific course of action involving 13 principal points and urged that the Government immediately undertake that course of action in the interest of peace with freedom and as a means of preventing world war III.

Now, against that background, we have heard a good deal of talk in the last week or two about what is being called a conference at the summit. In language that you and I can understand, this means a meeting of the leaders of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union.

A great number of important questions have been raised in connection with this proposed conference. For example, where is the summit; and if the place finds a geographical location, what is the meaning of the word "summit"?

Could this term have the meaning of old Greek mythology that the gods were meeting at the high point of land.

There is also a practical question raised as to who, if anyone, can speak for the masters of the Kremlin.

In my considered judgment, the most important question of all is, What are those who participate in the conference going to talk about and what are the prospects that such a conference might, in any way, contribute to man's age-long quest for peace and freedom.

In this connection the Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Investigate Communist Aggression, which I have referred to previously, made this, among other, recommendations:

"That in the advancement of the American program for world peace and freedom all efforts therein be measured against the criteria of whether they assist the captive peoples to hasten the day when they may achieve their liberation, and that all acts or omissions which tend to confirm their enslavement be rejected."

I do strongly commend this recommendation as the steady guidepost to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles to be used in all their advanced preparations for the conference, as well as such deliberations as may develop as a consequence of the talk now going on about a conference at the summit.

If we, as a Nation, fail to do less than follow the course which this recommendation clearly charts, we will, in my opinion, have deserted our fundamental traditions and political institutions.

The many enslaved nations which cry out for the emancipation of their people look to the United States as their last great hope.

The people of Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Slovakia, Czechia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and other enslaved nations suffering under a common tyranny, have the common aspiration for those freedoms which are reflected in the spirit of the constitution of Poland which we commemorate today.

When these nations are freed from the chains of Russian communism and have, by the unqualified exercise of the principle of national self-determination, regained for themselves and their posterity the benefits of liberty and self-government—only then will we have opened the door to a just and enduring peace.

The spark of individual liberty and love of human freedom has burned brightly in the breasts of all true Poles down through history. It was this spark which brought General Kosciuszko and other Polish heroes of the Revolutionary War to our shores. It was this same spark which brought thousands upon thousands of the sons and daughters of Poland to America to help build this great democracy which we today so

cherish. It is this same spark burning in the breasts of mankind which will eventually put us on the path to peace and freedom—a goal which will be attained only when all the enslaved nations are liberated.

Davy Crockett Was a Tar Heel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the Davy Crockett smash-hit song has focused the attention of the American people on the life and exploits of one of our most colorful early pioneer heroes.

The passage of time has somewhat dimmed the record of Davy Crockett. Although he was one of the best known of all the frontiersmen of the early 19th century, historians have not given his life the attention it deserves. Until just a few weeks ago, the mention of Davy Crockett would hardly have stirred a ripple of interest. Today his name is a household word—at least in every household where there are youngsters.

It remained for a talented songwriter, recognizing the dramatic appeal of the Davy Crockett story, to capture the imagination of the American public by depicting the highlights of Davy's career in a song that has literally taken the country by storm.

As proof that interest in Davy Crockett is not confined to boys and girls, I remind you that on last Thursday the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], speaking in the well of the House, paid his respects to the memory of Davy Crockett and reminded us of some of the lessons we can learn from the example of his record and career as a Member of Congress more than 100 years ago.

Davy Crockett is generally understood to have been a native of Tennessee. The author of the song says that he was born in that State, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] spoke of the pride Tennesseans have for him as a native son.

I cannot contradict the claim that Davy Crockett was born on soil that is now Tennessee. But, the statement that Davy was born in Tennessee does not tell the whole story. At the time Davy Crockett was born on August 17, 1786, the State of Tennessee was not in existence.

Davy Crockett was born a resident of the great State of North Carolina and remained a citizen of our State until 1790 when Congress accepted a deed of cession from North Carolina for the territory which is now Tennessee.

Indeed, we have even closer ties than this with the Crockett family. Davy's father lived for a time in my home county of Lincoln in the State of North Carolina. He fought against the British and Tories at King's Mountain in a battle which, incidentally, was the turning point of the Revolutionary War and led directly to the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

Tradition has it that Davy's father struck up a close acquaintance with some of the men who came across the Blue Ridge Mountains from the then western territory to help fight the British at King's Mountain, and, after the war, he was persuaded to return with them to the territory which a few years later became Tennessee.

Although Davy Crockett is said to have been illiterate, he was sufficiently educated to write a very readable and interesting autobiography. He did not have the advantage of much formal schooling, but acquired his education in the same way that Abraham Lincoln did. If his autobiography was not written in classical language, it shows that he possessed great native intelligence and a ready, if rustic, wit.

The following sentences are quoted out of context from Davy Crockett's autobiography to show something of his style of writing and as evidence on the question of his nativity:

My father's name was John Crockett, and he was of Irish descent. He was either born in Ireland or on a passage from that country to America across the Atlantic. He was by profession a farmer, and spent the early part of his life in the State of Pennsylvania. * * * He fought in the Battle of King's Mountain, against the British and Tories, and in some other engagements, of which my remembrance is too imperfect to enable me to speak with any certainty. At some time, though I cannot say certainly when, my father, as I have understood, lived in Lincoln County, in the State of North Carolina. How long I don't know. But when he removed from there, he settled in that district of country which is now embraced in the east division of Tennessee, though it was not then erected into a State.

I was born, according to the best information I have received on the subject, on the 17th of August, in the year 1786; whether by day or night, I believe I never heard, but if I did, I have forgotten. * * * At the time my father lived at the mouth of Limestone, on the Nolachucky River.

Davy Crockett was elected to Congress as a supporter of Andrew Jackson, and the district from which he came was predominantly Jackson territory. However, when President Jackson departed from what Davy Crockett believed to be right, Davy vigorously opposed him. Davy's strong opposition to some of the policies of President Jackson brought down upon him the displeasure of the administration, and in his autobiography Davy credits his defeat for reelection to the active fight made against him in the campaign by officials of the administration.

It was after his return to private life that the struggle of the Texans for independence attracted Davy Crockett's attention. He says in his autobiography that he was appealed to by Texans to come to that territory and help them in their fight for independence. He threw himself into that struggle and gave his life in the cause of liberty, just as he sacrificed his political career because he would not surrender his principles to hold public office.

This is the great lesson we can all learn from the life and career of Davy Crockett.

Davy apparently kept a diary during the battle of the Alamo, because the

closing chapters of the book contain a day-by-day account of the siege. His last entry in the book was made on March 5, 1836, and in the closing pages he described a sortie from the Alamo in which Davy and several companions ventured out into "no man's land" to rescue a member of the besieged party who was returning to the fort following a fruitless effort to get help.

The following is the last entry made by Davy in his book:

March 5. Pop, pop, pop. Bom, bom, bom, throughout the day. No time for memorandums now. Go ahead. Liberty and independence forever.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has now reached its 40th anniversary. It is difficult to assess the tremendously significant part this organization has played in the progress of aviation in this Nation. The great strides that the aviation industry has made could not have been possible without the research and advice of the NACA. Its contribution to the national defense is incalculable. The NACA is the Government agency charged with the responsibility for conducting an adequate program of scientific aeronautical research. It was established in 1915 to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution. The committee serves without pay; its only compensation being the great satisfaction it receives from the importance of its work and the success of its research. Its membership is comprised of its Chairman Jerome C. Hunsaker, Vice Chairman Detlev W. Bronk, Joseph P. Adams, Allen V. Astin, Preston R. Bassett, Leonard Carmichael, Ralph S. Damon, James H. Doolittle, Rear Adm. Lloyd Harrison, Ronald M. Hazen, Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, Lt. Gen. Donald L. Putt, Donald A. Quarles, Arthur E. Raymond, Francis W. Reichelderfer, Oswald Ryan, Gen. Nathan F. Twining.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times in its issue of May 13, 1955, tips its editorial to the NACA on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

Under unanimous consent, I include the editorial in the RECORD, as follows:

NACA AT FORTY

One of the bulwarks of our national defense and a spearhead of our peacetime progress in the air is celebrating the 40th anniversary of its establishment. This is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics founded by act of Congress and first appointed by President Wilson in 1915. Serving without pay, the committee operates like a board of directors, establishing policy and planning the research programs to be followed by the 7,000 civil-service personnel

who make up the technical and administrative staff. The programs have resulted in developments without which we would have lagged behind both in the weapons which have protected our freedom and in the great network of commercial air transport which knits the Nation so closely and binds us in so short a space of time to the rest of the free world.

At the great Langley Aeronautical Laboratory in Virginia; the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory at Moffet Field, Calif., and the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, many of the enormous forward strides in aerodynamical design which make possible today's flight above the speed of sound and in engines and rocket-power plants have received their initiative and progressed through technical guidance from the committee. As Representative VINSON, of Georgia, has well said, "There is not a military or commercial plane flying today in this country which does not reflect in some way the research of the NACA."

Norway Independence Day in Greater New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday afternoon at Leif Eriksson Square in Brooklyn, N. Y., the Norwegian-American 17th of May Committee of Greater New York, 1955, celebrated Norway's Independence Day. There was an immense colorful parade and a gathering of at least 20,000 people who listened to the program at the parade's conclusion. My good friend and distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] and I were accorded the honor of addressing the huge assemblage. The program read as follows:

PROGRAM

(Leif Eriksson Square, Brooklyn, N. Y., Sunday, May 15, 1955—3 p. m.)

Star-Spangled Banner: The Freeport High School Band, Dr. J. Maynard Wettlaufer, director.

Introduction: Einar Bredland, cochairman, 17th of May Committee.

Master of ceremonies: Edward C. Halvorsen, chairman, 17th of May Committee.

Invocation: Rev. Leif T. Gulbrandsen, pastor, Trinity Lutheran Church, Flushing, N. Y.

Welcome and opening remarks: S. A. Haram, president, the Norwegian Children's Home Association.

Greetings: Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, Member of Congress.

Greetings, Norwegian Government: Hon. Thor Brodtkorb, Consul General of Norway. Ja, Vi Elsker Dette Landet: Viking Junior Band, Irving Bardon, director.

The Norwegian Singing Society: O. William Erickson, director.

Greetings: Hon. John J. Cashmore, president, Borough of Brooklyn.

The Freeport High School Band, entertainment: Dr. J. Maynard Wettlaufer, director.

Greetings: Hon. JOHN H. RAY, Member of Congress.

Seventeenth of May Sermon: Rev. J. Ingvald Opsal, pastor, Our Saviour's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Gud Signe Noregs Land (first verse): The Freeport High School Band.

America (first verse): The Freeport High School Band.

Crowning of Miss Norway: By Consul General Thor Brodtkorb (sponsored by Scandinavian American Business Association, Inc.). Selections by Peder Tonnesen, tenor.

The following were my remarks on this occasion:

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, my distinguished friend and colleague, Congressman RAY, the Honorable Consul General of Norway, Commissioner Nolan, all the distinguished guests here on this platform, ladies and gentlemen:

It is indeed a privilege and a high honor to address this distinguished gathering at this wonderful parade today which commemorates the 141st anniversary of Norway's Independence Day, May 17, 1955. Especially is it so for one born here in Brooklyn of Irish parents who has had the opportunity to visit beautiful Norway on three occasions over the years.

I am grateful to your chairman, Mr. Halvorsen, Mr. Bredland, Reverend Opsal, Reverend Gulbrandsen, and all the members of your committee for their kind invitation to address you briefly on this historic occasion. I have always followed the developments and activities of Norway with a great deal of admiration, and I applaud the achievements of Norway's stable and democratic government in a world faced with strife and discontent in many areas, particularly those unfortunate nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Throughout the past 141 years the Constitution of Norway has withstood the test of time. The people of Norway have decisively rejected communism and all other forms of government alien to their democratic ideals and principles. As a matter of fact they have made the ideals of democracy a living and revered reality.

We in the United States shall long remember the determined and courageous stand of the Norwegian people against Nazi Germany, both in combat and in the tenacious unrelenting underground struggle in the years that followed. The people of Norway not only vigorously fought and opposed Nazi Germany but also have consistently defied Communist Russia, despite the fact that Norway has a common boundary with the Soviet monster and is menaced by the huge Red army which is in such close proximity.

Not only have the people of Norway demonstrated rare courage and bravery in war and in the potential threats of this cold-war period, but equally important, they have created an example of democracy that serves as an inspiration to the freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Americans of Norwegian birth and descent have made great contributions toward the things that make for a better life here in the United States. They have played a decisive role in the enrichment of our lives by their culture, their music, their industry and their strong religious and moral convictions. Because of these strong convictions and their love of American ideals they have given us many notable and effective leaders in our Government and in our public service.

This is truly a heartwarming and inspiring patriotic demonstration. I not only extend congratulations to the people of Norway on the anniversary of their constitution but also my friends here in Brooklyn of Norwegian birth and descent.

My fervent wish for Norway is that this annual celebration shall stand as a symbol of the continuing close association between our two countries in defense of that political liberty for which the Norwegian constitution stands. May all of us be blessed by the establishment of peace and freedom everywhere, and a world in which peaceful citizens and nations need no longer be on guard against aggression and tyranny.

Public Law 24, the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, thinking it will be of general interest to my colleagues, I am extending my remarks to include a tabulated summary of the appropriations provided for in Public Law 24, the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act. This was compiled at my request by Elizabeth Elward, of the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It follows:

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture:	
Agricultural Research Service.....	\$650,000
Agricultural conservation program.....	* (1)
Total, ch. I.....	650,000

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce:	
Office of the Secretary.....	* (2)
Civil Aeronautics Administration: Claims, Federal Airport Act.....	* (2)
Civil Aeronautics Board: Payments to air carriers..	8,900,000
Maritime activities:	
Operating-differential subsidies.....	50,000,000
Salaries and expenses.....	400,000
Repair of reserve fleet facilities.....	970,000
Repair of reserve fleet vessels (liquidation of contract authorization).....	* (5)
Bureau of Public Roads:	
Federal-aid highways (liquidation of contract authorization).....	95,000,000
Forest highways (liquidation of contract authorization).....	3,500,000
Public lands highways (liquidation of contract authorization).....	875,000
Total, Department of Commerce.....	159,645,000

Independent Offices—Small Business Administration:	
Salaries and expenses.....	* (4)
Revolving fund.....	

*Indicates transfers, limitation increases, etc.

¹ Continues available uncommitted balances through Dec. 31, 1955.

² Authority to transfer not to exceed \$110,854.

³ Authority to transfer not to exceed \$840,000.

⁴ Increase of \$75,000 in limitation.

⁵ Authority to transfer an additional \$224,000.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER II—continued

Department of Defense, Civil Functions—Department of the Army, Canal Zone Government: Operating expenses.....	\$230,000
Total, ch. II.....	159,875,000

CHAPTER III

Department of Defense—Interservice Activities:	
Claims.....	(4,320,000)
Retired pay.....	(8,000,000)
Do.....	(14,000,000)
Military personnel, Army.....	(150,000,000)
Military personnel, Air Force.....	(110,000,000)
Total, ch. III.....	* (286,320,000)

CHAPTER IV

Foreign Operations—Mutual Security: Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance.....	* (6,500,000)
Independent Offices—Export-Import Bank: Administrative expenses.....	* (55,000)
Total, ch. IV.....	(6,500,000)

CHAPTER V

Independent offices:	
Federal Civil Defense Administration: Surveys, plans and research.....	
Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	85,000
Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	100,000
General Services Administration: Expenses, general supply fund.....	* (200,000)
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Salaries and expenses.....	240,000
Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission.....	15,000
Veterans' Administration: Compensation and pensions.....	240,000,000
Readjustment benefits.....	155,000,000
Grants to Republic of Philippines.....	611,000
Total: Veterans' Administration.....	395,611,000
Total, ch. V.....	396,051,000

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior—Bureau of Land Management: Management of lands and resources.....	350,000
National Park Service: Jones Point Bridge.....	600,000
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service: Salaries and expenses.....	2,570,000

* Increase in limitation.

¹ To be derived by transfer from available appropriations.

² To be derived by transfer from "Mutual Defense Assistance, Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific, 1955."

³ To be derived by transfer from "Defense Public Works, community facilities."

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER VI—continued

Independent Offices—National Capital Planning Commission:	
Salaries and expenses, Washington regional mass transportation survey.....	\$200,000
John Marshall Bicentennial Commission.....	10,000
Total, ch. VI.....	3,730,000

CHAPTER VII

Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security:	
Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.....	* (10)
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.....	7,500,000
Total, Department of Labor.....	7,500,000

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education:	
Payments to school districts.....	20,000,000
Assistance for school construction.....	48,500,000
Public Health Service:	
Assistance to States, general.....	* (11)
Indian health activities.....	¹² (100,000)
Social Security Administration—Bureau of Public Assistance: Grants to States for public assistance.....	238,000,000
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance: Salaries and expenses.....	* (10,620,000)
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Services.....	
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	306,500,000
Railroad Retirement Board: Salaries and expenses.....	¹⁶ (256,000)
Total, ch. VII.....	314,000,000

CHAPTER VIII

Public Works—Department of the Interior—Southwestern Power Administration: Operation and maintenance.....	400,000
Total, ch. VIII.....	400,000

*Indicates transfers, limitation increases, etc.

⁴ Increase in limitation.

⁵ Language change.

¹¹ Increases limitation for personal services from \$2,400,000 to \$2,418,000.

¹² To be derived by transfer from "Retired pay of commissioned officers," fiscal year 1955.

¹³ Language making this appropriation available for the payment of members of the uniformed force of the Fire Department.

¹⁶ To be derived from the Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund).

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER IX

Department of State:	
Salaries and expenses.....	¹⁷ (\$750,000)
Contributions to international organizations.....	
Missions to international organizations.....	¹⁸ (12,500)
International contingencies.....	¹⁹ (100,000)
Department of Justice:	
Legal Activities and General Administration:	
Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals.....	300,000
Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals.....	200,000
Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry:	
1954.....	198,267
1955.....	870,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Salaries and expenses.....	1,100,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses.....	1,250,000
Federal Prison System: Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons.....	180,000
Support of United States prisoners.....	600,000
Total, Department of Justice.....	4,698,267

The Judiciary:

Supreme Court of the United States: Care of the building and grounds.....	12,500
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses.....	13,300
Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:	
Salaries of judges.....	900,000
Salaries of supporting personnel.....	86,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	380,000
Travel and miscellaneous expenses.....	45,000
Salaries of referees.....	²⁰ (20,800)
Expenses of referees.....	²¹ (34,575)
Total, the Judiciary.....	1,436,800
Total, ch. IX.....	6,135,067

CHAPTER X

Treasury Department:	
Bureau of Accounts: Salaries and expenses.....	85,000
Coast Guard:	
Operating expenses.....	¹⁸ (1,100,000)
Retired pay.....	¹⁹ (584,000)
Reserve training.....	²⁰ (46,000)
Total, Treasury Department.....	85,000

¹⁸ To be derived by transfer from "Acquisition, construction, and improvements."¹⁹ To be derived by transfer from "Government in occupied areas," fiscal year 1955.²⁰ To be derived by transfer from "Contributions to international organizations," fiscal year 1955.²¹ To be derived by transfer from "Educational aid for China and Korea."²² To be derived from the referee's salary fund.²³ To be derived from the referee's expense fund.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTER X—CON.

Post Office Department: Foreign mail transportation, 1947.....	¹⁴ (\$25,000)
Independent offices — Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses.....	63,000
Total, independent offices.....	63,000
Total, ch. X.....	148,000

CHAPTER XI

District of Columbia:	
Operating expenses:	
Office of Corporation Counsel.....	²² (2,500)
Metropolitan Police (additional municipal services, American Legion Convention).....	²³ (15)
Department of Public Health.....	(650,300)
Public welfare.....	(152,900)
Settlement of claims.....	(28,008)
Judgments.....	(10,587)
Audited claims.....	(155,095)
Total, operating expense.....	(996,890)
Capital outlay: Capital outlay, miscellaneous.....	(26,500)
Total, ch. XI.....	²³ (1,023,390)

CHAPTERS XII AND XIII

Legislative branch:	
Senate: Salaries and expense allowance of Senators, mileage of the President of the Senate and of Senators, and salary and expense allowance of the Vice President: Compensation of Senators.....	320,001
Compensation of the Vice President of the United States.....	1,667
Office of the Secretary: Joint recording facilities.....	3,905
Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: For adjustment of salaries.....	140
Joint Committee on the Economic Report, salaries and expenses.....	3,800
Contingent expenses of the Senate:	
Furniture.....	5,000
Miscellaneous items.....	51,950
Packing boxes.....	500
Postage stamps.....	115
Total, Senate.....	387,078
House of Representatives: Salaries of Members.....	1,468,000
Coordinator of Information.....	2,000
Majority leader.....	5,400
Folding documents.....	10,000
Total, House of Representatives.....	1,485,400

*Indicates transfers, limitation increases, etc.

¹⁴ To be derived by transfer from "Railway mail service, 1947."²² Increase in limitation for settlement of claims.²³ Unless otherwise provided, District of Columbia appropriations shall be paid out of the general fund for the District of Columbia.

Public Law 24, 84th Cong. (2d supplemental appropriation bill, 1955)—Continued

CHAPTERS XII AND XIII—CON.

Legislative branch—Continued	
Capitol Police:	
Capital Police Board.....	\$21,139
Capital Police Board.....	38,972
Total, Capitol Police Board.....	60,111
Architect of the Capitol:	
Capitol Buildings.....	16,000
Capitol Grounds.....	611,000
Senate Office Building.....	53,000
House Office Buildings.....	
Additional House Office Building.....	5,000,000
Additional Senate Office Building.....	
Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	5,680,000
Government Printing Office: Printing and binding.....	700,000
Total, chapters XII and XIII.....	8,312,589
CHAPTER XIII	
Judgments and authorized claims:	
Judgments and authorized claims.....	3,234,377
Judgments and authorized claims.....	6,269,842
Total, ch. XIII.....	9,504,219
Grand total.....	898,805,875

NOTE.—Continues antistrike provisions.

Collector of Customs Appointment for the Idaho-Montana District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVIN B. FJARE

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a letter I have today sent to the Honorable George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury. Yesterday a gentleman from Idaho was nominated to be the new Collector of Customs at Great Falls, Mont. We in Montana regard this as one of the few Federal jobs that rightfully should be filled from our great State, and consequently I am vigorously protesting the nomination from our neighboring State of Idaho.

The letter is as follows:

MAY 12, 1955.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have been informed that an Idaho man has been nominated for the position of Collector of Customs for the Idaho-Montana District, with headquarters at Great Falls, Mont.

I want to vigorously protest the nomination, and ask that the nomination be reconsidered, because this position has historically belonged to Montana. We have the

great majority of interest in every respect in this position, by virtue of miles of boundary served, number of ports of entry, volume of traffic, and flow of commerce.

Your careful reconsideration of this nomination will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely yours,

ORVIN B. FJARE.

Increase Minimum Wage to \$1.25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage is being considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. I appeared before the committee today and made my plea in behalf of the underpaid workers who are looking hopefully to Congress for relief and a decent living wage. It is my sincere hope that the committee will act favorably so the bill can be considered by Members of the House whom, I am convinced, will set a minimum wage which will more nearly approximate today's high living costs.

My statement before the committee follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the House Education and Labor Committee, I wish to thank you for this opportunity to testify before this committee today on the proposed amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The proposal to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour and to extend coverage of the act to workers not now protected by a minimum wage floor and the provisions for time and a half for overtime work will continue to enlist my complete support.

An increase in the minimum wage is not only a family necessity, but it is a national economic necessity as well. We must think in terms of increasing the purchasing power of the low income earner. A clear analysis compels us to regard the worker as a consumer whose increased purchasing power could stimulate a lagging economy, rather than thinking of him as an economic liability to his employer whose wages, if increased, will either drive his employer out of business or raise prices for all of us.

Opponents of the \$1.25 minimum wage repeatedly say that this would increase unemployment and many firms would be forced to reduce their payrolls or even go out of business. This is the same argument that was used when the minimum wage was set at 30 cents in 1939 and again when it was set at 75 cents in 1950. This grim prophecy simply has not been borne out by facts.

In 1950 when the minimum wage was increased to 75 cents an hour, there were practically no plant shutdowns or layoffs resulting from this measure. Opponents of the measure then, as now, had predicted economic disaster.

In fact, the Department of Labor studies revealed that in five low-wage industries—southern sawmills, men's dress shirts and nightwear, fertilizer, men's seamless hosiery and wood furniture—even though the higher minimum wage required increased wages for a substantial proportion of the workers in those industries the adjustment to the higher wage scale was made with "only minor determinable effects."

At that time the Secretary of Labor said in his annual report, "Prices for products

of low-wage industries affected substantially by the necessity for the payment of higher wages do not seem to have risen as a group any higher than prices of other products. * * * Increased efficiency of production, particularly through mechanization and high volume operations, apparently absorbed much of the increased cost."

It is self-evident that every American worker is entitled to a decent standard of living. It is also axiomatic that no worker can enjoy what we like to refer to as the American way of life on less than \$1.25 per hour.

The average worker putting in a 40-hour week will earn approximately \$2,500 a year if he makes \$1.25 an hour. An annual income of \$2,500, although it may be an improvement over the income derived from the present 75-cents-an-hour provision, is still far from adequate to meet the minimum budget requirements of an average family.

In 1951, the Bureau of Labor Statistics worked out a minimum-income chart for an average family of 4 based on living costs in 34 cities throughout the United States. The budget required for a basic minimum standard of living varied from \$3,812 to \$4,454. It would require a minimum wage of \$1.91 to earn enough to meet the lowest income requirements for a decent standard of living as defined by this study. The lowest budget figure was \$3,812, the minimum necessary to live in New Orleans.

A minimum wage of \$1.25 an hour does not sound unreasonable to me. I don't know of a single area in the United States where you could provide your family with decent housing, clothes, adequate food, and even minimum medical and dental care on an income of \$1.25 an hour or \$2,500 a year. And this includes no allowance for recreation or luxuries.

The administration proposal to scale down to 90 cents an hour what already appears to be a barely adequate increase in the minimum wage, to \$1.25 an hour, is sheer ignorance of the basic facts of the living costs in today's economy.

The Consumers' Price Index rose 14 percent between January 1950 and November 1954, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Wages have been raised five times since 1950 in major American industries. The minimum wage was set at 75 cents an hour in 1950. Today, 5 years later, it is still 75 cents. It is totally inadequate and unrealistic in view of the economic picture today to increase the minimum wage to anything less than \$1.25 per hour.

The administration proposal to increase the minimum wage to 90 cents an hour will not improve the living standard of 3 million workers who earn more than 90 cents an hour, but are still existing on a substandard level. The 3 million workers who earn 95 cents or perhaps \$1.04 an hour would receive no benefit from such legislation. They will continue to exist on a powdered-milk and dried-meat diet. They will still be unable to afford adequate housing and even modest conveniences.

In addition to increasing the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour, I sincerely hope that coverage will be extended to many groups not currently protected by the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

According to recent estimates there are approximately 44 million people engaged in private employment, exclusive of proprietors, self-employed persons, unpaid family labor, and executive, administrative, and professional employees.

Of these 44 million employees, 13.6 million were not covered because they were engaged in intrastate activities and 6.4 million were specifically exempted from the minimum wage and overtime provisions.

The present Fair Labor Standards Act provides more limited coverage and contains

more exemptions from the wage and hour provisions than the original act of 1938 did.

Coverage should certainly be extended and many of the groups now exempted should be protected under this law.

An inadequate minimum wage is responsible for unbalanced diets, the inability to afford medical and dental care and poor housing. These conditions foster malnutrition, sickness, slums, illiteracy, juvenile delinquency, and crime. The entire community and the Nation as a whole, suffers when our most valuable asset—our citizens—are forced to live on a substandard level.

For these reasons, the majority of the constituents of the 12th District of Illinois favor, and I shall support, a \$1.25 an hour minimum wage and extended coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Iowa Manufacturers Important in Nation's Industrial Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Iowa has long been recognized as the leading agricultural State in the Nation but few realize the extent of Iowa's industrial development.

Hundreds of Iowa's industries are nationally known, and several rank as the biggest of their kind in the Nation. For instance, Iowa has the largest cereal plant, washing machine industry, fountain-pen manufacturer, door and mill-work factory, fresh-water pearl-button industry, popcorn processing plant, processor of honey, plastic fiber skate-wheel plant, silvery iron factory, independent pork processing business, wringer manufacturer, wheel tractor manufacturing plant, single operated packing plant, manufacturer of portable crushing and screening plants, aluminum plate rolling mill, warm air heating systems manufacturer, poultry equipment manufacturer, cellophane producing plant, rotary pump builders, producer of automatic valves and regulators, 2- and 4-cycle gasoline engine manufacturer.

With 3,736 manufacturing plants located in 588 cities and towns, there is a wide and even distribution of industry throughout the State. There are 2,270 different products made in Iowa, and world trade carries the products of 539 Iowa manufacturers who are directly engaged in exporting.

Since Iowa produces 10 percent of the Nation's food supply, food manufacturing and processing leads all other industries in the State, accounting for more than half of the value of the State's manufactured products. But food is just one of the major manufacturing industries.

BIG STRIDES IN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

During the post-World War II years, nearly 900 new industries have set up shop in Iowa, affording more than 35,000 additional job opportunities and creating an additional annual payroll in excess of \$120 million. Figures indi-

cate that the growth and development of Iowa is going forward at a faster rate than the Nation as a whole. With the value of Iowa's manufactured products exceeding the value of her agricultural products, the State has a fine economic balance.

Father's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with pardonable pride, I take the floor of the House as Father's Day approaches this year, in support of a joint resolution asking our President to set aside a day as an official tribute to the millions of fathers in America.

This day should stand as a symbol of the important role of the head of the family, not just on Father's Day, but every day throughout the year.

It has often been said that the home is where democracy begins. This is true because the home is not a place where democracy is merely talked about. It is not a mere word. It is a way of life that is practiced day in and day out. If every member of the family is treated with respect and love; if every member of the family honors his responsibilities, shares the burdens as well as the pleasures of family life, then we have built a group of citizens who will have respect for the rights of others and will approach their responsibilities toward their fellow citizens and their obligations in a democratic society with a cooperative spirit and a willing hand.

Since children look to their father as an example for their conduct and a guide to follow over the rough road of growing up, it is his responsibility to set a standard of conduct in his relations with the family that will be worthy of emulation. Fatherhood is the highest fiduciary relationship. It demands that he set aside the time and develop the patience that will make him the kind of father that is always available when his children have a problem, when they feel the need to talk over some little difficulty—no matter how small this problem may be. A small problem to an adult mind may be a huge burden in the mind of a child. It is the father's heavy

obligation to be available to help resolve this problem.

When I read the tragic stories that appear daily in our newspapers of delinquent juveniles I often think to myself, how different this story might have been if there had been an understanding heart and a guiding hand when the early signs of that child's frustration, hostility, and insecurity first became evident in his belligerent or perhaps withdrawn conduct.

A child does not turn into a juvenile delinquent overnight. There are many danger signs to the observant father. But the danger signs will go unheeded unless that father is an astute and sensitive observer. So many of us in the hustle and hurry of modern living attempt to compensate for our failure to provide time, companionship, and society by giving our children material gifts and a questionable higher standard of living.

It is almost impossible for a loving father who spends time with his youngsters, who plays with them, who discusses their school problems, their friends, and their daily experiences with them, to fail to observe that something is troubling a child. If his attitude toward his schoolwork, toward his brothers and sisters is an unhealthy one, this is the time to set the course straight again. When the problem is just developing, the solution is fairly obvious and quickly achieved.

Family life is actually the child's first experience in group living, in learning the joys that come from working together as a team, in experiencing the rare pleasure that comes from understanding that it is truly better to give than to receive. Family life is the child's first contact with discipline. It is where he begins to appreciate and understand that you learn to rule by being ruled.

Under the guiding hand of the father and mother working together as a parent team, the child comes face to face with what is expected of him in his relations with the other members of the family and society. Here the child will acquire the spiritual values which will develop into his philosophy of life.

The father's role is not an easy one. With 10½ million married women employed in the new social structure, the amount of time available for supervision and rearing of children of necessity has become limited in a number of homes. Many additional chores of family upbringing have now in the new order fallen to him.

our hearts unto wisdom. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain. Teach us to value a conscience void of offense and the royalty of inward peace and confidence above all the pedestals, prizes, and preferments earth can give.

May the tyranny of majorities and the tirades of minorities be equally impotent to sway us from the right as Thou dost give us to see the right. Along the road of this day, as we face its demanding tasks, and of every day, may we walk with Thee in the bright fellowship of

While his obligations to his family are heavy, the rewards are rich indeed. The father who has fulfilled his responsibilities as a loving and understanding parent is truly helping to build a mature and worthwhile adult. He has helped to build a family relationship that is a full and rewarding experience for every member of the family and is the bulwark of a democratic society. He has respected the individuality of every member of that family unit so that together they are a team, and individually they will become democratic adults who can face any decision, or challenge that life will present to them.

For all of these sacrifices fathers make in giving their children emotional security, spiritual guidance, compassion, and understanding of their fellowmen, I propose that we set aside the third Sunday in June of each year as a justly earned tribute to the Nation's fathers.

The Scintilla Division of Bendix Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 16, 1955

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in the village of Sidney, in Delaware County, N. Y., which I have the honor to represent, the Scintilla division of Bendix Aviation, is to receive its second star on their civil-defense flag.

We are very proud of the Scintilla Division in Delaware County. Their factory is ideally situated in a beautiful village of 5,000 and their labor-management relations have always been of the best.

Mr. John A. MacLachlan, the publisher of the Sidney Enterprise, in a recent letter to me, has this to say about Scintilla:

Scintilla division of the Bendix Aviation, which as you know is our big Sidney industry (employment about 4,000 people) is to be honored next week by receiving the second star in their civil-defense flag. The presentation is to be made by Lt. Gen. C. R. Huebner, New York State, director of civil defense.

Scintilla is the first industrial plant in New York State to achieve the honor of being a three-time winner. First the flag, then one star, and now the second.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply

those who are able to say at the last, "I have fought a good fight, I have kept the faith." In the name of the Master of all good workmen, we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. FREDERICK G. PAYNE, a Senator